

rose as they actually did during this 10-year period. Where would the steel industry stand today?

"Well, on the basis of official, published figures, it would be more than \$21 billion in the red.

"The steel industry would have operated in the red in 9 out of the 10 years. Its losses in 1955 and 1956, taken together, would have been at least equal to the entire sum spent by the industry for its postwar expansion.

"Of course, none of this could have actually happened, since the whole industry would have been bankrupt long before it could have accumulated a deficit of this size. The shipments could never have been made since the plants which made the shipments possible could never have been built. Failure to recover costs would have prevented expansion.

"Steel prices, like any other prices, must reflect increases in the cost of doing business, including wages—or you go out of business."

To show up the absurdity of any significant wage increase coming out of profits you need only compare the size of a 5-percent increase in wages with total corporate profits. In the highest year on record, 1950, such a wage increase would take about 20 percent of all corporate profits before taxes.

A squeeze like that on profits would have three inevitable effects: It would stop investment cold, lower productivity, and increase unemployment. And that, I submit, is hardly the pattern of progress or the way to strengthen our economy.

The mystery is why anyone would think wages should come out of profits in the first place. The result is to pinch off a

principal source of additions to productive power. And, since the only way we can hope to live better is if we produce more for our national warehouse, then the minute we take from profits we are, in effect, subtracting from living standards.

So, I think it is time we replace confusion with understanding of the real source of our economic strength. And the time is over-ripe for us to end the squabble over dividing what we have and get on about the business of multiplying more for the great number of our people.

For one thing, we can cease trying to get more by taking it from someone else. In particular, I mean trying to take from profits to put into wage envelopes. No one really gains in that attempt—least of all the workman. As unemployment increases, production drops and progress halts. Instead of raising costs, prices, and the cost of living, let us rather raise productivity, progress, and the standard of living.

That is what we all want. A balanced overall movement forward with wages, profits, and productivity going up in and not out of step. And I am confident that this is well within our abilities, despite the marking time we may have to do this year as inventories are pared down.

Ahead of us is a new era—a space age as some call it. It will be a time of tremendous technological change. In my opinion we are just now at the doorstep of a new warehouse for America. One that can be filled with greater wealth, more new things from more new processes in the next 5 years than we have ever seen before in our history.

As the result of research and development financed by American industry because profits made it possible to do so, there is a

great backlog of new ideas, theories, and principles building up in our Nation's laboratories. To translate them into new jobs, factories, machines, and finished products will require tremendous new investments.

Those investments, however, will not be forthcoming unless a real incentive—a prospect of profit—entices investment. And, unless those investments are made we will, indeed, slip behind the Russians. Not just in single, spectacular scientific achievements, but in the real race we are running and in which our free system far excels their slave system. I mean our success in providing better living standards and an opportunity for a better life for more people.

Let us admit and have done with it that the Russians have impressed the world. But, let us also recognize that they have done so with a policy of fear and an instrument of terror. I think we would much rather be what we are, the encouragement of a world yearning for freedom and for a better life in peace to enjoy useful progress.

Lincoln said it for us a long time ago. Speaking on Washington's birthday in 1861 at Independence Hall, he referred to the inner meaning of the Declaration of Independence as "giving liberty not alone to the people of this country but hope to the world for all future time."

That hope was never needed more than in the year 1958. We provide it as we stand together, adhere to and apply those economic principles which can make America stronger than ever in a greater age of progress than any so far known. For that goal and to keep alive that hope of all men for a free, undivided world at peace, we stand together—or fall.

Thank you.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1958

(Legislative day of Monday, February 10, 1958)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Bishop V. J. Brizgys, auxiliary of Kauanas, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the common father of all people, we praise Thee and give thanks for the dignity bestowed on men created in Thy likeness and who call themselves Thy children and each other's brothers.

We pray for all those who, understanding this dignity, were and are harbingers of culture, peace, mutual love, and respect among people and nations. Today we wish to pay tribute to all those who, having understood the dignity of man, were and are pioneers of freedom for people and nations.

Today, too, we remember a nation whose name has been mentioned among European nations from days beyond recall, and which time and again has served Europe's Christianity and civilization by crushing dangerous forces that threatened to destroy it. We remember Lithuania, which in her long history has tasted of glory and misfortune, and which today has lost her freedom. She hopes and strives to regain this freedom. In her sufferings, she has not been left alone. A whole world of good will sympathizes with Lithuania and other unfortunate nations. Lithuania thanks

Thee, O Lord, especially for the friendship of the United States of America, whose motto is In God We Trust, whose way of life is freedom, and who, being the most progressive and dynamic nation, is at the same time a pioneer of true peace and freedom for other nations. Almighty God, we beseech Thee to bless and protect this Nation, that it might be a servant of Thy divine providence in establishing in the world an order worthy of the dignity which Thou hast bestowed on man.

We pray to Thee for the Lithuanian nation, which for centuries has held dear and has protected Thy greatest gift—freedom; and which today, bowed under the yoke of bondage, cries to Thee and to all people of good will for help. She wishes to live and work in a family of free nations for her own and mankind's welfare.

O Lord, bless America, bless Lithuania, and bless all other nations who trust in Thee and strive to create life in Thy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Monday, February 10, 1958, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that

on February 12, 1958, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1408) to provide allowances for transportation of house trailers to civilian employees of the United States who are transferred from one official station to another.

REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States: In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 13, 1958.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7300. An act to amend section 15 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act;

H. R. 9271. An act to authorize the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution to use certain real estate in the

District of Columbia as the national headquarters of such society; and

H. R. 9304. An act to amend section 12 of the act approved September 1, 1916, as amended.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 7300. An act to amend section 15 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act;

H. R. 9271. An act to authorize the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution to use certain real estate in the District of Columbia as the national headquarters of such society; and

H. R. 9304. An act to amend section 12 of the act approved September 1, 1916, as amended.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business, with statements in connection therewith limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONSERVATION OF WATER RESOURCES

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the insurance of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and the act of August 28, 1937, as amended (relating to the conservation of water resources), and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Cooperative Extension Service, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON RESERVE FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of training of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and the progress made in strengthening of the Reserve components during the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FLIGHT TRAINING PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight training program, covering the period August 1, 1956 to January 1, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (with an ac-

companying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation liquidation fund, for the period ended September 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the effects of defense expansion of machine tool supply upon the competitive status of the machine tool industry, dated February 10, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION (IN LIQUIDATION) AND DEFENSE LENDING DIVISION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (in liquidation) and Defense Lending Division, Office of Production and Defense Lending, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS RELATING TO RESTORATION OF BALANCES OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prior to restoration of balances, Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, as of January 14, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, four reports prior to restoration of balances under the appropriation and fund accounts "Salaries and expenses, Commodity Exchange Authority, 1957", "Salaries and expenses, Farmers' Home Administration, 1957", "Salaries and expenses, Farmers' Home Administration, 1956", and "Salaries and expenses, Farmers' Home Administration, prior years" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prior to restoration of balances requesting restoration of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and Expenses" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN STATUTES UNDER THE NAVIGATION AND VESSEL INSPECTION LAWS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation and vessel inspection laws (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD AND MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration, for the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Executive Officer, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that committee, for the period January 1-December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

A letter from the Under Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS FOR 1961 MEETING OF PERMANENT INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF NAVIGATION CONGRESSES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appropriation of funds to finance the 1961 meeting of the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 1

"Relating to memorializing the Congress of the United States to undertake immediate action to make upward adjustments in the pay scales of key personnel in the Armed Forces in the interest of national defense

"Whereas the events of recent months and particularly those involving the extraordinary advances, by the potential enemies of our country and of the Free World, in the development of the most terrifying of military destructive weapons including thermonuclear bombs, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and other devices, clearly point up the need for immediate action to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of our military defense forces; and

"Whereas it is a matter of common knowledge that the inability of the various branches of the Armed Forces to retain highly trained personnel in the services has for many years been a key factor in reducing the effectiveness of such forces in providing both the United States of America and the Free World with efficient and effective defensive forces; and

"Whereas the inability of the Armed Forces of the United States to operate to provide an efficient defense where highly trained personnel are not given the remunerative incentive to remain in the service for a period beyond that of their original enlistment is illustrated by published statistical data including the fact that in 1955 the Air Force lost men who cost \$2 billion to train; that the cost of training an electronics expert is \$20,000, that the time needed to train him is 3 years, and that 90 percent of these individuals leave the service after their 4-year enlistments, having given the Government but 1 year of expert service during their enlistment; and the fact that such turnover has resulted in a disproportionate expenditure of available moneys on the training of a continuous stream of newly recruited personnel at the expense of having to

forgo concentration on the development of new weapons and techniques; and

"Whereas the need for increased efficiency in the Armed Forces and the peril created by deficiencies in that regard is particularly apparent to the people of the State of California, which is the most vulnerable of all the States of the Union, with its great population centers bottled up by natural barriers, where prompt escape is virtually impossible; and

"Whereas this State is the cradle of the electronics, missile, and airframe industries; and

"Whereas it is common knowledge that the greatest potential enemy of this Nation now possesses at least 400 missile-launching submarines capable of completely annihilating this State in the matter of a few minutes; and

"Whereas the legislature of this State deems the matter of such importance and urgency that no further delay of any kind can be countenanced; and

"Whereas the legislature is informed that the military establishment is in desperate need of a means to attract and retain scientific, professional, combat leadership, and management to maintain its deterrent power, and cannot presently compete for trained personnel, and that these deficiencies can best be removed by the passage of Federal legislation such as that proposed by S. 2014 and H. R. 7475, introduced at the first session of the 85th Congress, and H. R. 9979 which has been introduced at the second session of the 85th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That because of the gross vulnerability of the State of California and the fact that time is of the essence, that the President and the Congress of the United States make consideration of the necessary steps to increase the salaries of servicemen a matter of top priority and bring about the necessary changes at the earliest possible time; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to prepare and transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Resolution 20

"Memorializing Congress concerning establishment in California of a soil and water conservation laboratory

"Whereas the Congress of the United States will be considering the establishment of soil and water conservation laboratories in the irrigated areas of the United States; and

"Whereas there is a great interest throughout California's extensive agricultural community in research into problems relating to soil and water management and conservation; and

"Whereas an excellent location for such a conservation laboratory exists at the Davis Campus of the University of California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate of the State of California, That Congress is again respectfully memorialized to consider the great need for such laboratories; and be it further

"Resolved, That Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture are urged to provide necessary land at or near the Davis Campus of the University of California upon which a conservation laboratory may be established and maintained; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of

this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate in the Congress of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of Agriculture."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Resolution 19

"Resolution memorializing Congress concerning establishment in California of a soil and water conservation laboratory

"Whereas the Congress of the United States will be considering the establishment of soil and water conservation laboratories in the irrigated areas of the United States; and

"Whereas there is a great interest throughout California's extensive agricultural community in research into problems relating to soil and water management and conservation; and

"Whereas, an excellent location for such a conservation laboratory exists at the Davis Campus of the University of California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Assembly of the State of California, That Congress is again respectfully memorialized to consider the great need for such laboratories; and be it further

"Resolved, That Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture are urged to provide necessary land at or near the Davis Campus of the University of California upon which a conservation laboratory may be established and maintained; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate in the Congress of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of Agriculture."

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Works.

"House Resolution 30

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to expedite plans for a flood-control program along the Big Sandy River

"Whereas January 29, 1958, marks the anniversary of the most disastrous flood along the Big Sandy River within recorded history;

"Whereas the frequent recurrence of devastating floods along said river over a period of years has caused abject and inexpressible misery and despair to citizens of the area;

"Whereas such floods have occasioned not only physical suffering and deprivation but have resulted in loss of or damage to inestimable millions of dollars worth of property;

"Whereas the health, safety, and general welfare of many citizens of the Commonwealth of Kentucky and adjacent States are in constant danger from future depredation of said river and the economic welfare of every citizen of the surrounding area is affected by such depredations; and

"Whereas the damage to be expected from future floods can only be averted or mitigated by a coordinated comprehensive program of flood control along said river: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the Senate concurring therein)—

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States is urged to act in the exercise of its broad legislative powers to provide a means of flood control along the Big Sandy

River and to cause such a program to be put into effect at the earliest possible time.

"SEC. 2. That the Congress act in this regard by making provision for a system of dams and floodwalls along said river and the utilization of any other measures which it deems necessary to accomplish the desired end.

"SEC. 3. That the clerk of the senate be and is hereby directed to send copies of this memorial, duly authenticated to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each of the Senators and Representatives from the Commonwealth now serving in the Congress, and to the Secretary of the Interior."

The petition of Samuel A. Levy, of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 7141) to amend title 2 of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Long Island General Assembly, Fourth Degree (Patriotic), Knights of Columbus, Kings County, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the DAV-Philians Social Security Organization, Rizal, Philippine Islands, relating to House bills 8029 and 8167, to provide for the payment of claims for supplies and services furnished the irregular, or guerrilla forces of the former Commonwealth of the Philippines during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Livermore Elementary Teachers Association, Livermore, Calif., favoring the extension of Public Laws 815 and 874, relating to Federal aid to impacted school districts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors, County of Maui, T. H., relating to the erection and maintenance of a post office at Hooilehua, T. H.; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Federation of Civic Associations, Inc., Washington, D. C., relating to the death of the late Senator Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 2233. A bill to further amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1285).

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment:

S. 2224. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding advertised and negotiated disposals of surplus property (Rept. No. 1284); and

S. 2231. A bill to amend section 203 (c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the exercise of options contained in certain leases of Government property (Rept. No. 1288).

ASSISTANCE TO SENATORS IN CONNECTION WITH VISITING FOREIGN DIGNITARIES

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original

resolution (S. Res. 259), and submitted a report (No. 1287) thereon, which resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in order to assist the Senate properly to discharge and coordinate its activities and responsibilities in connection with participation in various interparliamentary institutions and to facilitate the interchange and reception in the United States of members of foreign legislative bodies and prominent officials of foreign governments, the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized from February 1, 1958, through January 31, 1959, to employ one additional professional staff member to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of section 202 (e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay the actual and necessary expenses incurred by Senators and the aforementioned employee in connection with activities authorized by this resolution and approved in advance by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which shall not exceed \$5,000 from February 1, 1958, through January 31, 1959, from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers certified by the Senator incurring such expenses and approved by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ENTITLED "INCREASED COST OF ISSUING AND RENEWING PASSPORTS" (S. REPT. NO. 1288)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations I submit a report entitled "Increased Cost of Issuing and Renewing Passports," and ask that it be printed. I believe the report will be of great interest to every Member of this body.

This report, based upon a year's study conducted by the Comptroller General of the United States at the request of the committee, recommends that the appropriate jurisdictional committees of the Congress reevaluate the existing fee schedules relating to passports. The report shows that the total unit cost for passport issuance and renewal is estimated at \$8.20—\$3.75 for costs incurred in the United States and \$4.49 for costs incurred at foreign service posts.

As Senators will note, the Comptroller General makes several suggestions for improving the issuance of passports. Major recommendations are: First, that passports issued to Federal employees at foreign service posts be for the entire tour of duty, thereby obviating the need for renewals, which would result in savings in costs of issuing passports; second, that the duration of passports be related more directly to the actual length of time travelers expect to be overseas, rather than to a fixed period of time, as at present.

In connection with the latter recommendation, the Comptroller General suggests three time categories: First, 6 months to 1 year with no renewal; second, 3 years on issuance and renewal for 2 years; third, 5 years on issuance with no renewal.

Separate fees would be fixed for each of the above categories, which amounts

would relate to the duration and renewal privilege of the passport.

The Comptroller General points out that the fee for the issuance of a passport, of \$9, exceeds the cost thereof, \$8.20, by 80 cents, whereas the fee for renewal, of \$5, is \$3.20 less than the cost—the cost of issuance and renewal being considered equal.

He also points out that the question of whether the fee for a passport is a source of revenue, and thus not necessarily related to cost, or a charge for a Government service, for which the fee should be set at an amount sufficient to recover costs, is a matter of policy to be determined by the Congress.

Mr. President, I recommend this report to the attention of every Member of Congress. As Members are aware, the issuance of passports has been a subject of lengthy examination by the Committee on Government Operations for the past 3 years.

As a result of extensive staff studies in the 84th Congress, the Passport Office was completely reorganized to provide improved service to the public. The matter of an adjustment in fees and other recommendations made by the Comptroller General in his report to the committee should be given consideration by the appropriate jurisdictional committees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

REPORT ENTITLED "ACTION BY THE CONGRESS AND THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT ON THE SECOND HOOVER COMMISSION REPORTS, 1955-57" (S. REPT. NO. 1289)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I submit a report made by its Subcommittee on Reorganization, entitled "Action by the Congress and the Executive Branch of the Government on the Second Hoover Commission Reports, 1955-57."

This report, prepared at my direction by the staff of the Subcommittee on Reorganization, of which I have the privilege of serving as chairman, is a factual compilation of all action taken to date upon the recommendations of the Second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, of which former President Herbert Hoover was Chairman, and two distinguished Members of this body, Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, and Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, were members.

A full measure of credit for the achievement made so far in implementation of the Hoover Commission's recommendations, as indicated hereafter in my remarks, should go to my illustrious colleague, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, who served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization during the 84th Congress. Also, I pay the highest tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Maine, the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee

on Reorganization, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, who, along with the other members of the subcommittee, worked in true bipartisan spirit to enact good reorganization legislation into law.

And, finally, Mr. President, I cannot speak too highly of the splendid cooperation given the Subcommittee on Reorganization by the chairman of the main Government Operations Committee, the senior Senator from Arkansas, Senator McCLELLAN, who for years has been a bulwark of support at every step along the rocky reorganization road.

In my opinion, Mr. President, this report will prove of inestimable value to Members of the Congress, the general public, and historians because it contains, to my knowledge, the first published tabulation of action upon each of the Hoover Commission's 519 recommendations, showing those recommendations implemented, those partially implemented, and those upon which no action has been taken. To my knowledge, nowhere else in the Government does this information exist in its present form.

For the information of Senators, I would like to briefly summarize the subcommittee's findings upon the 519 Hoover Commission's recommendations. Two hundred seventy-four, or 53 percent, have been implemented, or partially implemented, or are in the process of being implemented at this time. Forty-four recommendations, or an additional 8 percent, have been accepted by the executive branch of the Government, but implementation has not begun upon them. Thus, of the 519 recommendations, 318, or 61 percent, either have been implemented or accepted for implementation—a record of some substance in the relatively short period of time since the Hoover Commission reports were filed in 1955. Two hundred and one recommendations are still under review by the Congress or the executive branch or have been rejected for various reasons.

As may be noted, through perusal of this document, many proposals of the Second Hoover Commission which would provide for revolutionary changes in many important Government programs, such as Federal lending rates, public power development, the civil-service system, military procurement and legal procedures, among others, are still under consideration by the executive branch of the Government and appropriate Congressional committees. The 53 percent implementation figure, therefore, does not mean, substantively speaking, that from the viewpoint of major changes in the Government's operations, 53 percent of the Hoover Commission's overall product has been implemented. The bulk of the action taken to date has been in the administrative or organizational areas rather than in the controversial policymaking areas which would alter basically major Government programs, to which reference is made above.

Mr. President, I recognize full well the limitations upon all of us, particularly in these times of stress and strain; but, I commend this report to each Senator's attention, even if only during his infrequent moments of leisure he can give a

few minutes to it. I am sure each Member of this body will find valuable information relating to the Hoover Commission reports with which he can respond to the many inquiries from constituents which I know he receives daily, as do I. A limited number of copies will be available in the subcommittee office for distribution by Senators as they may see fit.

The report I now send to the desk is divided into three sections. I would like at this point in my remarks to include a brief summary of each section for the convenience of Senators in studying it.

Section I; status of the Second Hoover Commission reports; Section I contains an overall summary, report by report, together with a separate analysis of each of the 20 Hoover Commission reports, showing action taken, recommendation by recommendation.

Section II, action by the 85th Congress, 1st session, to implement the recommendations of the second Hoover Commission: Section II contains a detailed analysis tracing the legislative history of each of the 297 bills introduced in the 85th Congress, 1st session, to implement the Hoover Commission's recommendations. This section is a supplement to Senate Report No. 95, 85th Congress, 1st session, published February 21, 1957, which traces the legislative history of the more than 500 Hoover Commission bills introduced in the 84th Congress.

Section III, action on reorganization plans submitted to the Congress under the Reorganization Act of 1949: Section III contains a brief history of the Reorganization Act of 1949, plus a statistical tabulation of each of the 56 reorganization plans submitted to the Congress under the authority of that act, beginning with Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1949 and concluding with Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957.

Mr. President, I submit the report, and ask that it be printed as an official Senate report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Walter K. Scott, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Isaac W. Carpenter, Jr., resigned;

Everett F. Drumright, of Oklahoma, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to China, vice Karl L. Rankin;

Philip D. Reed, of New York, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information; and

Erwin D. Canham, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information.

By Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Abbot L. Mills, Jr., of Oregon, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 3265. A bill for the relief of Juan Jose Elorriaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 3266. A bill to suspend the requirement for the performance of annual labor on mining claims heretofore located for the development and production of fissionable source material; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN (by request):

S. 3267. A bill for the relief of the Government of the Republic of Iceland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. GREEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. 3268. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 3269. A bill for the relief of Mildred (Milka Krivec) Chester;

S. 3270. A bill for the relief of Nick Tsallikis;

S. 3271. A bill for the relief of Souhail Massad;

S. 3272. A bill for the relief of Janez (Garantini) Bradek and Francisca (Garantini) Bradek; and

S. 3273. A bill for the relief of Irene Korponay and Rita Korponay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3274. A bill for the relief of Claude S. Reeder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 3275. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3276. A bill for the relief of Carl Ebert and his wife, Gertrude Ebert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3277. A bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 3278. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, by providing for the correlation of diplomatic action and defense preparation and action in the National Security Council; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. FLANDERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 3279. A bill for the relief of Charles P. Childs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for Mr. COOPER):

S. 3280. A bill to authorize the full acreage reserve program for the 1958 crops provided for by section 105 (c) of the Soil Bank Act;

to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. AIKEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to stay any reduction in support prices for dairy products until Congress can make appropriate provision for such support prices; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to stay any reduction in support prices or acreage allotments until Congress can make appropriate changes in the price-support and acreage-allotment laws; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

GREATER COOPERATION AMONG NATO NATIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I submit a concurrent resolution bringing to the attention of the President of the United States a resolution adopted at the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference held last November in Paris.

The concurrent resolution requests the President to use his best efforts to bring about a meeting of representative citizens from all the NATO nations to examine ways in which greater cooperation among the Atlantic nations may be promoted.

It was my privilege to serve as chairman of the United States Congressional delegation to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, and it is in that capacity that I introduce this Senate concurrent resolution.

Several other Members of the Senate indicated that they desired to join in the submission of this concurrent resolution. It was my feeling, however, that I should speak only for members of the Senate delegation to the Paris conference.

So that others may join, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that before this concurrent resolution is referred to the appropriate committee it be held at the desk until the next session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 62) to request the President to use his best efforts to bring about a meeting of representative citizens from all the North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations to examine ways to promote greater cooperation among those nations, submitted by Mr. GREEN (for himself and other Senators), was referred

to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, at the third annual conference held in Paris, in November 1957, adopted unanimously a resolution, part of which required implementation by the governments of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

Whereas that portion of the resolution containing such recommendation and disposal for action, reads as follows:

"This Third Annual Conference of NATO Parliamentarians—

"Recommends that their governments, in consultation with the Standing Committee and Political Committee of the Conference, bring about, in accordance with the constitutional and governmental processes of their countries, a conference composed of leading representative citizens selected on a nonpartisan basis and directed to convene as often as necessary in order to examine exhaustively and to recommend how greater cooperation and unity of purpose, as envisioned by the North Atlantic Treaty, within the Atlantic community may best be developed,

"Proposes that to fulfill this purpose the members of the conference should, as far as possible, be officially appointed but should act in accordance with their individual convictions and that the findings and recommendations . . . of the conference proposed be reported to the appropriate committees of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, to the North Atlantic Council and to member governments for consideration and appropriate action in accordance with the constitutional processes of each member country": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to use his best efforts to implement, in cooperation with other governments of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the recommendation and proposal of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, as set forth in the above resolution adopted at the third annual conference in Paris on November 16, 1957.

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 259), relating to assistance to Senators in connection with visiting dignitaries, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full where it appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

Mr. HAYDEN submitted Senate Resolution 260, printing as a Senate Document and additional copies of report entitled "A Review of United States Foreign Policy and Operations," submitted by Senator ELLENDER to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HAYDEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CERTAIN FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a thorough investigation into the operation of Federal agencies is long overdue, in my opinion.

Recent events underline the urgency of making such an investigation, and

serving to focus attention upon mounting misgivings of several years regarding these agencies.

As I announced yesterday, I now submit a resolution to establish a select committee "to determine whether the independent agencies of the Government have been carrying out their functions in a manner which accords with the public interest."

The resolution itself best describes the problems which require investigation and analysis. The resolution states:

Such inquiry shall seek to establish, among other things—

(1) whether such agencies have been improperly influenced by industries with respect to which they exercise regulatory or other functions;

(2) whether ethical standards consistent with the duties vested in such agencies have been maintained in the execution of those duties;

(3) whether such agencies have exercised the powers delegated to them by the Congress in conformity with Congressional policy;

(4) whether the independence of such agencies has been impaired by Executive interference; and

(5) whether the laws relating to conflicts of interest are adequate to protect the public interest in those areas of governmental activity which are under the jurisdiction of such agencies;

(6) whether agency procedures and existing law are adequate to safeguard the public, the parties, and to prevent favoritism.

Mr. President, it is my belief that the Senate has an independent obligation to undertake such an investigation. Regardless of what may be done by the other body, the Senate can be fully advised as to the need for remedial legislation, if any, only by an inquiry of its own. The resolution does not duplicate the mandate which the Moulder subcommittee, now the Harris subcommittee, received. There may be an area of overlap. All the indications are, however, that there is more than enough for committees of both bodies to do.

As I said yesterday, I believe the Congress should make a two-barreled approach to this matter, so as to be able to shoot to the American people the facts regarding the actual situation in the case of the conduct of these administrative agencies.

So far as the Senate is concerned, it should be observed that the agencies and problems involved come within the jurisdiction of several different committees. In order to have a unified, across-the-board inquiry, a select committee will be required, in my judgment; the job would be fragmented if it were parcelled out along the jurisdictional lines of the standing committees.

There is only one answer to the growing public distrust of the supposedly independent Federal agencies: a thorough inquiry conducted in accordance with rules of fair procedure. Whatever others may do, the Senate should set up a select committee to do the job.

I am fully aware of the fact that there may be those who think my proposal violates some rule of comity with the House, but I have looked into this matter sufficiently to satisfy myself that it is the clear public duty of the Senate of

the United States to proceed on its own, independently, with an investigation of conditions in the Federal agencies. I am satisfied that many of the allegations we have been reading about in the press make a prima facie case to support such an investigation. I am satisfied that with regard to other allegations there is sufficient evidence to make it a matter of public trust, owed the people of the United States, that the Senate pursue such an investigation, without fear or favor, and let the chips fall where they may.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be received and that the resolution be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 261), submitted by Mr. MORSE, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a select committee to be composed of 7 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, of whom 3 shall be members of the minority party.

SEC. 2 (a) The committee shall conduct a full inquiry and investigation to determine whether the independent agencies of the Government have been carrying out their functions in a manner which accords with the public interest. Such inquiry shall seek to establish, among other things—

(1) whether such agencies have been improperly influenced by industries or other interests with respect to which they exercise regulatory or other functions;

(2) whether ethical standards consistent with the duties vested in such agencies have been maintained in the execution of those duties;

(3) whether such agencies have exercised the powers delegated to them by the Congress in conformity with Congressional policy;

(4) whether the independence of such agencies has been impaired by Executive interference; and

(5) whether the laws relating to conflicts of interest are adequate to protect the public interest in those areas of governmental activity which are under the jurisdiction of such agencies.

(6) whether agency procedures and existing law are adequate to safeguard the public, the parties and to prevent favoritism.

(b) The committee shall, at its first meeting, to be called by the President of the Senate, select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members. Any vacancy in the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(c) As used in this section, the term "independent agencies of the Government" means those agencies in the executive branch of the Government which were established by act of Congress and vested with functions, regulatory or otherwise, to be exercised independently of the regularly constituted departments of the Government.

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to (1) hold such hearings; (2) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate; (3) require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (4) administer such oaths; (5) take such testimony either orally or by deposition; (6) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants

April 5, 1947, when United States Armed Forces were present in Iceland under the terms of the agreement between the United States and Iceland, dated July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 1547).

"Claims of the Government of the United States of America against policyholders of these same insurance companies which resulted from the same or similar incidents, have been evaluated, and set off, as shown in article I of this agreement.

"Article IV

"During the course of negotiations leading to this agreement, the representatives of the two Governments considered, but excluded from the setoff, those claims of the United States against policyholders of these insurance companies for expenses incurred relating to medical expenses, loss of services, burial expenses, and gratuity payment in cases involving injury or death of military personnel; which claims are to be regarded as having been taken into account, but waived, under the terms of this agreement.

"Claims of the insurance companies arising out of the agreement dated July 1, 1941, between the United States and Iceland, supra, which have not hitherto been presented and included in this settlement are to be regarded as having been waived.

"Article V

"Upon payment of the amount heretofore agreed upon in settlement of the claims described herein, the Government of the Republic of Iceland discharges and agrees to save harmless the Government of the United States of America, its officials, employees, or agencies and instrumentalities, its nationals or other individuals and organizations, for these and all other claims of these same claimants, which may have arisen out of the agreement dated July 1, 1941, between the United States and Iceland, supra.

"In witness whereof, the undersigned representatives duly authorized thereto by their respective governments have signed this agreement.

"Done at Washington, in duplicate, this 23d day of November 1956.

"For the Government of the United States of America:

"C. BURKE ELBRICK,

"[Department of State].

"For the Government of the Republic of Iceland:

"THOR THORS."

The cost of this proposal, if enacted, will be the dollar equivalent of 88,000 Icelandic kronur, which, at the rate of exchange of 16.29 kronur to 1 dollar, is \$5,402.09.

Sincerely yours,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,

Secretary of the Army.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the National Science Foundation has now been operating under the National Science Foundation Act of 1950—Public Law 507, 81st Congress, 2d session—for almost 7 years with only 2 minor amendments. During this time, it has grown from an organization with an operating budget of \$3.5 million to one with a budget request for \$140 million. This growth has been paralleled by a growing realization of the importance of science and the full dissemination of new knowledge uncovered by research.

While the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, has served the Foundation well in carrying out its responsibilities, we are today keenly aware of the importance to the furtherance of our own scientific progress of

closer cooperation between scientists in this country and those of other nations. This bill, which I am introducing on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, will, therefore, authorize the Foundation, with the approval of the Secretary of State, to award scholarships and fellowships to foreign nationals and to facilitate such scientific activities abroad as may be deemed to be in the interest of the United States. We must not isolate our scientific activities but must work ever closer with appropriate scientists elsewhere who are extending the frontiers of knowledge.

In addition to this amendment, the bill would make various minor amendments in the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 which the past 7 years have proved necessary and desirable.

The particular changes included in the bill are described in the analysis which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3268) to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The analysis presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF BILL TO AMEND THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

There is set forth below an analysis of each section of the proposed legislation to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950:

Section 1: The changes proposed for section 4 (d) and section 4 (e) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 relate to the annual meeting of the Board and are requested because of the fact that at the present time elections of officers of the Board for 2 years must take place at the annual meeting in December, whereas the terms of one-third of the members of the Board expire every second year on May 10. Accordingly, elections must presently be held 5 months before there is a change in the Board membership and, among the candidates for office, there often are those whose terms are expiring in the subsequent May. It would be desirable, therefore, to have the annual meeting after the new members are appointed and confirmed by the Senate so that the Board may elect its officers with knowledge of its composition for the ensuing 2 years. The latitude in setting the actual date is to permit the accommodation of as many members as possible in order to assure the fullest possible attendance at the annual meeting.

Section 2 and section 3: The changes proposed for section 5 (b), section 6 (a) and section 6 (b) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 are related to the same purpose. At the present time, the Board must approve the award of each fellowship and each grant or contract for basic research. This rigid requirement has posed serious problems for efficient operation in several instances. For example, when grants were being made for supplies for the scientific expedition to Antarctica in connection with the International Geophysical Year, time was of the essence. The lack of a Board meeting at which a contract or grant could

be approved at the proper moment was an obstacle to assuring the timely arrival of equipment for the scientists. Under the proposed change, it is contemplated that the Board might delegate specific authority to its executive committee or to the Director to approve grants for contracts between meetings of the Board in certain situations. The change in the required size of the executive committee is suggested for the purpose of giving the Board authority to constitute a smaller executive committee which could more easily be assembled for emergency action. In any event, the Board would still retain complete power to grant such authority or not as the whole Board saw fit.

Section 4: The deletion of the words "accredited" and "of higher education" in section 10 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is intended to take care of the relatively rare situation where the successful competitor for a fellowship wishes to study or work at a research institution in his field which is not an educational institution, for instance, at one of the National Institutes of Health. It is felt that, where the scientists judging the merit of the prospective fellow and his course of study or work believe that the applicant's proposal is sound, it is undesirable to limit his choice of institution in every case to an educational institution. The addition of the words "demonstrated and potential" in section 10 is for purposes of clarification.

Section 5: The changes proposed in section 11 (c) and section 11 (d) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 are technical and are intended to bring these sections in accord with the changes proposed for section 13. The change proposed in section 11 (e) is for purposes of clarification. At the present time, the law does not, for instance, specifically authorize the acquisition of property by condemnation or disposition of property, such as a scientific facility, by grant. These powers, however, seem to be inherent in the act so that the Foundation would have authority to support the conduct of basic research by acquiring property through condemnation or through assisting an institution to acquire a necessary facility held by the Foundation. It is, however, suggested that this section be clarified to make the authority explicit.

Section 6, section 7, and section 8: The changes proposed in section 13 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 are intended to permit the Foundation, with the approval of the Secretary of State, to support or to facilitate international scientific activities rather than merely to cooperate in research activities, and to award scholarships and fellowships or make other arrangements with foreign nationals for scientific study or scientific work. At the present time, the Foundation cannot grant scholarships or fellowships to foreign nationals and this amendment would remove this disability. The new section 13 (b) is designed to give the Foundation statutory authority to carry out scientific activities abroad in the interest not only of science but of our foreign relations. This authority would only be exercised where such undertakings are deemed to be in the interest of the United States, and with the approval of the Secretary of State. In the present era, no one country can have any monopoly of scientific talent and it is essential that we place ourselves in a position to cooperate more effectively with scientists abroad.

Section 9: The new section 14 (j) proposed to be added to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is designed to make it possible for the staff of the Foundation to keep up with the latest developments in their fields. At times, additional training or attendance at meetings may be required to assure that the Foundation's employees can maintain the highest competence and knowledge in their fields.

REPRESENTATION OF CERTAIN INDIGENT DEFENDANTS IN DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a nationwide system of public defenders for indigent defendants in criminal court cases, with provision for grants to bar associations, legal aid societies, and similar voluntary organizations providing free legal services to indigent defendants.

One of our basic constitutional guarantees is that in all criminal prosecutions in the Federal courts the accused shall have the assistance of counsel in his defense. Long study has convinced me of the need for Federal legislation in this area to supplement the work being done by private organizations and to provide this legal service in cases where there is no private organization undertaking the task.

As attorney general of New York State, I developed a program to provide public defenders, initially for youths under 21 but later to be expanded to everyone needing the service. Research both into the need for such a program within my own New York State and also throughout the Nation disclosed that there is substantial lack in many regions of adequate legal counsel for indigent defendants. In introducing this bill, we are seeking to fill the existing gap.

The true administration of justice requires that the rich and the powerful and the poor and the weak hold equal claims in the eyes of the law. When an indigent person, without counsel, is charged with crime and left to fend for himself against the organized authority of our whole society—the police departments, the district attorney's offices and the courts—the possibility of the miscarriage of justice is ever present.

The duty of a district attorney or United States attorney is to prosecute the guilty but also to save the innocent from conviction. In practice, zeal in the prosecutor's job—which is in the public interest—often makes the public prosecutor an advocate and justice requires an opposition as effective as the prosecution. A public defender is a public official, paid out of the public treasury, serving as counsel for a defendant financially unable to employ private counsel. He is, in effect, the counterpart of the prosecutor and like him serves the cause of justice in our society. Injustice breeds divisiveness and constitutes a continuing threat to a free society. When people lose their faith in the impartiality of the machinery of justice, they also lose faith in their government. We should ask ourselves whether we can afford the consequences of maintaining a system which purports to guarantee the equal protection of the laws to rich and poor alike, but in actual practice places a premium upon the financial ability of a person to defend himself in a criminal prosecution.

The scope of the problem can be seen in the fact that 6 out of every 10 persons cannot afford to engage counsel of their own choosing. In metropolitan

areas the proportion is higher. As many as 8 out of 10 require public or voluntary legal aid. And in New York State alone, criminal courts each year dispose of cases involving almost 250,000 defendants accused of all manner of crime, not including traffic and local ordinance violations.

A recent survey showed that of indigent defendants accused of crime, 40 percent received no form of legal aid whatsoever. Of the remaining 60 percent who did get legal aid—by public defenders, voluntary defender organizations such as the legal-aid societies, or counsel assigned by the courts—no more than 25 percent had been given an effective defense.

The idea of a private defender has its origins in antiquity, but the idea of a public defender is relatively new. It was suggested by a woman lawyer from San Francisco at the Chicago World's Fair in 1893. It was not until 1913, however, that any community in this country established a public defender office, the honor going to Los Angeles.

The public defender concept is no longer a novelty. Nine States: California, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, and Virginia—as well as Puerto Rico and the Canal Zone have adopted the system. In addition, public defenders exist in some municipalities: in Columbus, Ohio; Memphis, Tenn.; and St. Louis, Mo. In many other cities private organizations, such as the National Legal Aid Association, the Philadelphia Voluntary Defender Association, bar associations, and others, furnish representation to indigent defendants in criminal cases. In some places, as in Rochester, N. Y., limited public funds are available.

The bill provides that each United States District Court may appoint a public defender to be paid out of Federal funds. Whenever the district court decides that a defendant is financially unable to employ counsel, the court assigns the public defender. The bill also retains the present power of the court to assign counsel other than the public defender; in that case the bill provides that such special counsel shall be paid by Federal funds on a case-by-case basis. The bill further provides that:

Upon the recommendation of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts may make grants to legal-aid societies, bar associations, or other similar groups providing free legal services to indigent defendants.

Maximum salary for the public defenders is set by the bill at \$16,000, based upon the service to be performed, which shall be fixed by the Judicial Conference. In instances where grants are made to legal-aid societies or bar associations, the aggregate amount of any such grants made annually in any judicial district shall not exceed \$30,000.

Legislation providing a public defender was recommended to this Congress by the United States Attorney General, who said in part:

There is a community responsibility, consonant with the constitutional requirement, to provide full-time paid counsel, trained in the techniques of criminal law, to represent

the poor who are charged with crime. It is the business of all of us who are charged with maintaining our form of government within the framework of the Constitution to provide an adequate means of assuring every person of the assistance of counsel for his defense without regard to whether he has the means to pay for such counsel.

The general program also has the support of the American Bar Association.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3275) to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training which will provide the means for reducing the high accident rate of this employment.

It is not generally realized that the accident rate of the stevedoring industry is the highest of all our industries, and results in great suffering and hardship to the workers and their families, and necessitates an annual expenditure of nearly \$9 million, exclusive of medical costs. This intolerable situation clearly calls for a preventive program to reduce this shameful waste of human life and assets.

The Department of Labor, in keeping with the Eisenhower administration's legislative program to protect the interests and welfare of the workingmen of this country, has developed such a plan. It is proposed that the Secretary of Labor be given authority to issue and enforce safety standards in the longshore and ship-repair industry. Furthermore, there would be placed on the contractors a definite obligation to cooperate with the Department of Labor in furnishing safe employment in this industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter on this subject, addressed to me by the Honorable James T. O'Connell, Under Secretary of Labor, and an explanatory statement from the Labor Department, which accompanied the bill, be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1958.
The Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: I am transmitting copies of a draft bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training and for other fur-

poses. I am also enclosing copies of a summary statement explaining the need for the legislation and the purpose and effect of the bill.

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the Department of Labor. The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this bill for the consideration of the Congress, and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Your cooperation and assistance are appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES T. O'CONNELL,
Under Secretary of Labor.

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE EFFECTIVE SAFETY STANDARDS IN EMPLOYMENT COVERED BY THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

PURPOSE

This bill would amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, which relates to private longshore and ship repair operations within the Federal jurisdiction, to establish means for reducing the high accident rate in this employment. It would impose an obligation on stevedoring and ship-repair contractors to furnish safe employment and would authorize the Secretary of Labor to issue and enforce safety standards pertaining to their operations aboard ships and in drydocks.

The Secretary of Labor in connection with his supervision of the compensation provisions of the Longshore Act is presently authorized to make studies and investigations of the cause of injuries in employment covered by the act, and he may make recommendations to Congress and to interested employers and employees of means for reducing accidents. No authority exists, however, to issue or to enforce safety standards pertaining expressly to such employment. The proposal would give the Secretary such authority, but it would not extend to matters within the scope of statutes administered by the Coast Guard or regulations issued pursuant to such statutes.

The extremely hazardous nature of longshore employment is reflected in the latest figures compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The data which is available, while incomplete in scope, show an injury frequency rate in the stevedoring industry of 88.5 disabling injuries per million man-hours worked in 1956 (the last year for which safety information is available). In comparison, the average injury frequency rate in manufacturing was 12 in that year. The accident frequency rate in logging had for a number of years been the highest for any industry included in reports by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In 1956, however, the stevedoring rate of 88.5 substantially exceeded the 65 figure for logging. In operations under the Longshore Act in fiscal year 1957 (not reflecting operations under State compensation laws) 79,826 injuries were reported, 122 of which were fatal. In that year compensation expenditures under the act, which did not include medical costs, were \$8,780,437.

The varying conditions of safety which exist in stevedoring operations aboard ship in the numerous ports and with different employers can be effectively improved only through the medium of a Federal law.

Provisions of proposed legislation

An affirmative obligation would be placed on employers covered by the act to furnish safe employment. The Secretary of Labor would be authorized to establish regulations specifying measures essential to conditions of safety after interested persons had been given an opportunity to express their views on the proposed regulations.

The Secretary also would be authorized to:

1. Grant variations from prescribed safety standards, in his discretion, upon a showing of practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship if the safety of the employees concerned would be secured by such variation;

2. Provide for the establishment and supervision of safety training programs and consult with and advise employers regarding injury prevention;

3. Inspect places of employment and equipment and interview employees to ascertain whether the safety regulations adopted and published in accordance with the proposal are being applied;

4. Hold hearings and make decisions, based upon findings of fact, and for such purposes he and the district courts would have the authority and jurisdiction provided by section 5 of the Walsh-Healey Act (this section provides, in part, that the Secretary's findings shall be conclusive in any court of the United States if supported by a preponderance of the evidence);

5. Seek injunctions against continuing violations by employers; when violations of an employer are willful or when any person willfully hinders the administration of the act, the penalty of a fine through criminal action may be imposed.

The proposed safety authority would be inapplicable to private employees in the District of Columbia and to employees of Government contractors on defense bases and in foreign areas to which the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act have been generally extended. The District of Columbia has its own safety law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3277) to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, by providing for the correlation of diplomatic action and defense preparation and action in the National Security Council.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3278) to amend the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, by providing for the correlation of diplomatic action and defense preparation and action in the National Security Council, introduced by Mr. FLANDERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, there has been, over the years, an immense amount of discussion of the subject of the reorganization of the Department of Defense. That discussion has been heightened by the interest in the development of missiles and satellites and by the knowledge that interservice rivalries have played some part in slowing up developments in these advanced fields.

The administration has had reports on this problem from private sources. It has received the Gaither report which is classified so that its recommendations are not publicly known. It has received the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation report produced by private enterprise and publicly distributed. This report was likewise set forth by Mr. Nelson Rockefeller at one of the hearings of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee.

Many other suggestions were made to the Preparedness Subcommittee in those hearings. Mr. President, none of those suggestions appealed so strongly to me as did those of Admiral Nimitz.

Remembering that the President has taken on the responsibility for developing plans of reorganization and remembering that he has deputed this responsibility to Secretary McElroy, it might seem unwise and unnecessary for anyone to make suggestions during the interim. Nevertheless I feel that special attention should be drawn to certain of the proposals made by Admiral Nimitz.

There are two of his proposals that I feel may well be left for the consideration and recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. One of these is that the position of a separate nonvoting Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff be abolished and that the chairmanship should rotate successively through the Chiefs of Staff of the three services. A second suggestion of his is that the structure of the Defense Department should be simplified by doing away with the multitude of new Assistant Secretaries, removing them from the chain of command and reassigning them to the Secretary of Defense as advisers.

Mr. President, these are internal measures completely within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense, and I do not feel disposed to do anything more than to bring them to the attention of the Secretary through such means as this brief mention of them on the floor of the Senate.

There is, however, another of the admiral's suggestions which is not in the same category and which, I strongly believe, warrants discussion on the Senate floor. More than that, I believe it needs to be brought to the attention of the Congress and of the administration by such effective means as the introduction of a bill amending the National Security Act of 1947. Such amendments I am proposing.

The purpose of these amendments is to concentrate the President's authority for overall strategy in the National Security Council. The admiral makes a very proper distinction between strategic and tactical decisions. The latter he would leave with the services. The former he would put with the National Security Council under the chairmanship of the President. He said on page 3073 of the transcript of the proceedings:

The decisions that are made in the field are tactical. The fundamental difference between strategy and tactics is that tactics is what you do after you are in contact with the enemy. Strategy is what you do before you come in contact with the enemy or even before you come into a war with him.

Now, the tactical matters are settled very promptly by a single source of decision. Strategic matters involve such things as the preparation of great forces, the planning of bases overseas, the aid to allies or even it goes to the point of strategic decision to a recommendation to the President might be 'We had better do something about Spain and get them in on our side as allies' and then it passes out of the hands of the military planner.

Strategic decisions are the principal ones that are made in Washington, and those are—they are of such a nature that time is not so important.

Admiral Nimitz' most definite assignment of strategy to the National Security Council was in answer to a question of mine. I now quote from page 3085 of the transcript.

Senator FLANDERS. Admiral, you have made a very clear distinction, it seemed clear to me, between tactical questions or problems and strategic problems, and you have, as I have understood you, made a clear case for leaving the tactical problems in the hands of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Do I understand that strategic problems would, in general, be within the area of the Secretary of Defense and the President?

Where does the responsibility for the solution of strategic problems rest?

Admiral NIMITZ. Senator, I think you have put your finger on a very important point that was foreseen in the writing of the National Security Act of 1947.

Strategic problems affect not only the military services, but the people of the country as a whole. They affect the Treasury, they affect the industry generally, they affect labor.

It was for that purpose to consider those problems that the National Security Act wrote as one of its first instruments, the National Security Council which was to be presided over by the President as frequently as he could, and—or by the Vice President, and it was to be composed of the Secretary of Defense, the chiefs of the armed services, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Security Resources, National Security Resources Board.

Now that has disappeared from our act. The National Security Resources Board was set up to associate all of the alphabetical agencies that existed during World War II engaged in the production of material, in the production of food, in the distribution of manpower, and all of that.

Those are—that man would be a very important person but it was never—that Security Council for the National Resources was never used.

But the strategic problems that you have in mind should be settled by discussion in the National Security Council with the Treasury represented, and any other Cabinet head whose business is affected so that strategic decisions affect every part of the country.

Mr. President, at the time I heard those words of the Admiral it seemed to me that we here had the basic clue to reorganizing the Department of Defense. That conviction has grown with the intervening weeks. It is for that reason that I am here offering amendments to assign to the Council definitely the function of determining strategy under the President's direction, leaving tactical matters in the hands of the Chiefs of Staff of the three services with their interrelations coordinated by the Joint Chiefs. These tactical programs would be worked out in strict agreement with the strategic decisions handed down from the President through the National

Security Council to the Secretary of Defense.

Before referring to the amendments in detail let me say that when I came to investigate Public Law 253, which was the National Security Act of 1947, I was astonished to find how little change was needed to effect this reorganization. In fact, it was almost as if that had been the intent of the act, which intent had failed simply by not having it expressed clearly enough. Let me now proceed to go over the proposed amendments point by point so as to show how little needs to be done if we accept the plans offered by Admiral Nimitz in his testimony before the Preparedness Subcommittee.

First of all, there needs to be an addition to the duties assigned the National Security Council. The proposed amendment adds the Council should "determine defense strategy in its widest sense whether for cold war or active military operations, and whether in the military, political, or economic field of action, and to make recommendations to the President in connection therewith."

The next change suggested is in the membership of the National Security Council which sets up the Assistant Secretary of State for Policy Planning as an aid to the Secretary of State in his duties as a member of the Council. Since the major matters of strategy combine those of diplomacy and defense, the responsibility for diplomatic planning must be represented directly in the Council meetings.

Similarly, with the Secretary of Defense is included the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as aide. This is to bring the military experience and point of view directly into the same consultations.

There is added to the duties of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the requirement that he shall represent the Chiefs of Staff as aide to the Secretary of Defense in meetings of the National Security Council.

Mr. President, that seems to be the end of the changes required in the National Security Act. Each one of them is minor. But the accumulated effect of these minor changes makes a major change in the responsibilities for determining and carrying out national strategic policies. The National Security Council becomes the President's instrument for that purpose. The responsibility is located nowhere else. There is further added the responsibility in the Council for seeing to it that diplomacy and defense work to the same end.

Personally I feel exceedingly grateful to Admiral Nimitz for having brought this possibility to the attention of the Preparedness Subcommittee and thus to the Congress and to the administration. In presenting this amendment I am glad to play my individual part in assuring that it shall have considered attention.

FULL ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM FOR 1958 CROPS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the

full acreage reserve program for the 1958 crops provided for by section 105 (c) of the Soil Bank Act.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by the Senator from Kentucky, relating to the bill, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3280) to authorize the full acreage reserve program for the 1958 crops provided for by section 105 (c) of the Soil Bank Act, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for Mr. COOPER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. AIKEN is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, IN CONNECTION WITH HIS BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE FULL ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM OF THE SOIL BANK FOR 1958

Mr. President, briefly, the purpose of my bill is to restore the full acreage-reserve program of the soil bank for 1958 crops. It would do so by removing the limitation imposed last year, thereby authorizing the full amount of \$750 million provided in the basic act establishing the soil bank.

In the last session of Congress, a limitation of \$500 million was placed on the funds that the Secretary of Agriculture may use in carrying out the acreage reserve program of the soil bank for 1958 crops. I recall that this came about after the House of Representatives had voted to eliminate the acreage reserve program altogether, and to allow it no funds for the 1958 crop year. I believe it was at the insistence of the Senate that the program was continued, and that \$500 million—although less than the \$750 million that Congress authorized in the Soil Bank Act of 1956 for each of the following 4 years—was made available for 1958. I recall that on the evening the Senate passed the Agricultural Appropriations Act for 1958, I spoke on the floor of the Senate in support of the soil bank and adequate funds for it.

I believe neither the Department of Agriculture nor the Congress anticipated the widespread interest among farmers wishing to take part in the acreage reserve program this year—or the extent to which thousands of farmers would sign up for the soil bank. The Department of Agriculture can well be gratified by this enthusiastic, if unexpected, response. And it is my impression that, given adequate funds, the acreage reserve program may well show this year what it can accomplish toward fulfilling the hopes originally held for it by the Secretary of Agriculture and by the Congress.

It is already clear that in my own State and in many other States, for corn as well as for several other basic crops to which this program applies, the demand for soil-bank funds will far exceed the amount now available.

In recent weeks I have been in close touch with farm leaders, with the officials in my State and in the Department of Agriculture charged with the operation of this program, and with a great many farmers themselves, concerning this matter. I believe the problem is a serious one requiring immediate action by the Congress if the best interests of farmers and of our agricultural economy are to be safeguarded—and if thousands of farmers who have already signed up for this program, but for whom funds are not now available, are to be treated fairly and equitably under this major effort of our total farm program.

I hope that the Congress will act quickly to provide the additional funds which it is now apparent are needed.

More than half of Kentucky is in the commercial corn area, and farmers in 52 central and western Kentucky counties are entitled under the act to participate in the corn soil bank. I know that thousands of farmers expected to sign up for the corn soil bank this year and especially wish to do so in view of last year's crop failures and excessive rains which drowned out many of their crops and which in many cases resulted in soft or wet corn for which price support is not available.

I understand that hundreds of farmers lined up at county offices beginning at midnight on January 13, but many others believed that adequate funds were available and that they would have 8 weeks in which to sign up their cornlands for the soil bank. However, the sign-up had to be closed rather abruptly after only 1 week because of lack of funds.

Even so, nearly \$11 million would be required to fulfill the contracts already offered Kentucky farmers in these few days. But the State allocation for corn in Kentucky is now only a little more than \$6 million. I know that a similar situation exists in a great many other States and in some to an even more serious degree.

Unless the Congress acts, thousands of farmers will be unable to take advantage of this helpful program. Furthermore, I am concerned that many of them will fail to understand why their neighbors' contracts have been accepted, whereas their own cannot be.

It is natural that a new program of this scope would take a year or two to become generally accepted and that it would need to pass its shakedown trials. It may be that this year will show the real value of the acreage reserve, particularly in view of the fact that the great majority of participating farmers are now soil banking their entire allotment. I believe this new approach will go far toward significantly reducing overproduction. In previous years the farmer often could put only part of his allotment into the soil bank and yields on the remaining portions may have turned out favorably. I suggest that the Congress may wish to look closely at the success of the acreage reserve this year before coming to any final decision as to how long it should be continued.

We know that a sound agricultural economy is essential to a growing and prosperous national economy. In connection with the President's economic statement yesterday, I suggest that the soil bank may also be a good place for additional efforts at this time, both in support of farmers' income and their long-range interests and in the interest of the Nation as a whole. An additional \$250 million in soil-bank funds this year might well have an important effect in combating the cost-price squeeze with which farmers are faced and in supporting our whole economy, which is still so closely related to a healthy agricultural economy.

In any event, I believe it is important that all our farmers be treated equitably under this and every farm program, and that all have a fair chance to participate in it.

SUPPORT PRICES FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two joint resolutions. One of them is on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and myself, to prevent reduction in support prices of dairy products prior to consideration by Congress of such changes in price support laws as may be necessary at this time.

Mr. President, the Nation's dairy farmers are crying out to Congress to prevent Secretary Benson from further cutting dairy support prices April 1, under the misleading and unfounded pretext that it would lower milk prices to city consumers.

I want the record to show that the concern is nationwide, not just from great dairy States like Minnesota and Wisconsin. It is likewise bipartisan. Deep concern along the eastern seaboard has been reflected in statements of the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] opposing the cuts. Similar evidence of concern now comes from the west coast.

California's Legislature opened its session on Monday, February 3. The first order of business was Senate Resolution No. 1—sponsored by 39 senators, calling upon Congress to block the dairy price cut. That resolution passed the California State Senate unanimously, and was concurred in by the assembly with only six dissenting votes. That is a tremendous mobilization of bipartisan sentiment from a great State. I hope Congress heeds its appeal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of the California Senate Joint Resolution 1, as sent to me by John S. Watson of Petaluma, president of the Consolidated Milk Producers Association for San Francisco.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1, RELATIVE TO MILK PRICE SUPPORTS

Whereas Secretary Benson of the United States Department of Agriculture has announced his intention on April 1, 1958, to lower the dairy price support to 75 percent of parity; and

Whereas such action will result in a reduction of income to our Nation's dairy farmers of \$250 million at a time when many are already facing grave economic conditions; and

Whereas California dairy farmers receive 40 percent of their income from milk on the basis of factory milk prices and the proposed lowering of supports will reduce dairy farm income in California by more than \$7 million in 1958 with the reduction affecting 40 percent of the milk supply produced in California; and

Whereas 70 percent of dairy producers in the State would be directly affected by such a change and the resultant consequences would also seriously affect the other 30 percent of the producers in this State; and

Whereas since 1954, dairy farmers at their own expense have greatly increased programs of research for new outlets and engaged in trade promotion of dairy products and the dairy industry and allied organizations have worked out a program of self-help for the dairy farmer; and

Whereas legislation is now being proposed for consideration by Congress which would to a large extent eliminate the dairy farmers' problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That Secretary Benson of the United States Department of Agriculture be respectfully memorialized to withhold putting into effect any change in the existing dairy price supports until such time as the United States Congress has had an opportunity to study the problems of the dairy farmers and to consider and act upon proposed legislation to solve these problems; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, and to each Member of Congress representing the State of California.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as an indication of the feelings in the Midwest, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Gov. Orville Freeman, of Minnesota, voicing a similar appeal.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,

St. Paul, Minn., January 31, 1958.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUBERT: I have been deeply disturbed by two recent developments in the field of dairy farming and earnestly hope that the Congress will see fit to take remedial action concerning these developments. On December 18, 1957, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson announced that dairy price supports for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1958, would be at 75 percent of parity. This reduction of support prices to 75 percent of parity would mean a decrease in price for milk of 25 cents per hundredweight, or a decrease in dairy income for Minnesota farmers during the next marketing year of approximately \$20 million. In addition to the fact of a direct market cut on next April 1, the Secretary's announcement at a date more than 4 months in advance of the proposed effective date for the support cut has had a depressing effect on current prices for milk and dairy products.

On January 16, 1958, the President of the United States in his message to the Congress on agricultural programs recommended that the dairy price support should be set by the Secretary of Agriculture through administrative order at a price level between 60 and 90 percent of parity. This recommended minimum of 60 percent of parity would result in a price cut of about 75 cents per hundredweight for Minnesota milk, or a total reduction in dairy income in the State of Minnesota during the next marketing year of \$48 million.

In 1954 the Secretary of Agriculture made his first reduction in dairy support prices. This reduction was justified by Mr. Benson on the grounds that a lower price level would reduce total production of milk and increase income to the dairy farmer. The experience of the past 4 years demonstrates conclusively the bankruptcy of this policy. In the intervening period, production has increased every successive year and income to the dairy farmer has not improved. I believe we must have a new program for the dairy farmers of the Nation. I believe further that while Congress is working out this program, cuts in dairy price supports such as proposed by Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower should not be made. We must, at the very least, hold the line on dairy price supports until a new program to stabilize the dairy industry is worked out.

Therefore, I urge each of you to work for the enactment of legislation to hold dairy price supports at their current level until such time as a new program for dairy farmers has been adopted by the Congress and signed into law by the President of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Governor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 149) to stay any reduction in support prices for dairy products until Congress can make appropriate provision for such support prices, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. AIKEN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

STAY OF REDUCTION IN SUPPORT PRICES OR ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the second joint resolution, introduced on behalf of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and myself, would prevent:

Reductions in support prices or acreage allotments prior to consideration by Congress of such changes in the price support and acreage allotment laws as may be necessary as this time:

1. The support price (in terms of dollars and cents) for any commodity shall not be less than that available for such commodity during the marketing year or season which began in 1957; and

2. The total acreage allotted for any commodity shall not be less than that allotted for the 1957 crop of such commodity.

This joint resolution shall be effective only until such time as Congress shall make other provision for price supports and acreage allotments and provide for the repeal of this resolution.

This is the kind of action needed to stem the tide of recession, along with other proposals mentioned today by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The purpose of the joint resolution is to give the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry time that may be required for long-term legislative action in the field of agricultural policy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 150) to stay any reduction in support prices or acreage allotments until Congress can make appropriate changes in the price support and acreage allotment laws, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HAYDEN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 8381) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct unintended benefits and hardships and to make technical amendments, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE RELATING TO CERTAIN UNINTENDED BENEFITS—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on July 23, 1957, I called the attention of the Senate to a Treasury Department ruling wherein American corporations in

computing their income-tax returns were being permitted to deduct as legitimate business expenses the payments of bribes or kickbacks to officials or employees of foreign governments when doing business in their countries.

The particular case which was called to my attention to illustrate this practice is as follows:

The Lock Joint Pipe Co., 150 Rutledge Avenue, East Orange, N. J., had bid on several contracts for construction work in the Dominican Republic. Their bids were recognized as satisfactory and the company was approved for the work; however, before being awarded the contracts they were requested to and acquiesced in the payment of bribes or kickbacks to officials of that Government amounting in the aggregate to approximately \$1,800,000.

These bribes or kickbacks were added to the original bids submitted, and presumably upon being paid by the Dominican Republic for the work, the company converted this extra payment into cash and turned it over to an agent for distribution to the officials. All of these kickbacks or bribes were turned over to a Mr. Rogers in the form of cash with the exception of one check for \$100,000 which was paid to him in New York City.

For example, in one instance the Lock Joint Pipe Co. submitted a proposed bid of \$11,775,000 for a certain contract. A representative of the Dominican Republic, Mr. William Rogers—a British subject—who at that time was Chief of the Division of Aqueducts in the Dominican Republic, advised the company that their bid was acceptable provided that they included in the figure an additional \$100,000, which was to be paid over to him. Accordingly, the figure of the contract was revised to \$11,875,000.

Shortly thereafter Mr. Rogers stated that their bid as revised was acceptable but instructed the company to add another \$600,000 to the bid, bringing the total to \$12,475,000, with the understanding that the additional \$600,000 was also to be rebated to Mr. Rogers, who said that the additional item was being collected for the benefit of the dictatorship, and that \$500,000 of this amount was being paid over for the generalissimo. This left Mr. Rogers' take on this contract \$200,000.

Altogether, during the life of this particular contract a total of \$700,000 was distributed in kickbacks and bribes over the 4-year period 1949–52.

Again, in 1951, the company was advised that further installations were contemplated by the Dominican Republic, and this time the company offered to do the work for \$5,920,000, but, again, upon the suggestion of the same Mr. Rogers, they revised their contract price to \$6,030,000 with the understanding that the additional \$110,000 was to be collected and paid over to Mr. Rogers. Presumably after Mr. Rogers took the matter up with the generalissimo he returned to the company and instructed them to add another \$250,000, which he described as being for Trujillo.

This brought the revised contract price to \$6,280,000, with the bid including \$360,000 for kickbacks.

Later additional work on the project was proposed, and the contract was extended. The company's bid on this extension was \$7,162,000, and this time they were instructed to include two additional amounts: (1) \$500,000, and (2) \$150,000; bringing the revised bid to \$7,812,000, again with the understanding that the \$650,000 would be used as kickbacks to officials of the dictatorship. Mr. Rogers told the company that this \$650,000 was to be distributed, \$500,000 for the chief—\$100,000 for his own benefit, and \$50,000 for special purposes.

The payment of \$1,710,000 in kickbacks and bribes was apparently made in the Dominican Republic which added to another \$100,000 paid to Mr. Rogers in New York City in 1952 brought the total paid by the company in bribes or kickbacks to officials of the Dominican Republic to \$1,810,000.

It is interesting to note that the United States Government allowed all of these kickbacks and bribes as ordinary and necessary business expenses, and thereby deductible for Federal income tax purposes, with the exception of 1 payment of \$100,000 to Mr. Rogers in the State of New York, and disallowance of this item was based on the fact that bribery, even in commercial transactions among private persons, is unlawful in the State of New York.

The United States Government reasoned that "the payment of \$100,000 to Mr. Rogers in New York in 1952 violated that law and to allow a deduction for that payment would frustrate the policy of that State as evidenced by its laws."

It has always been my understanding that the payment of a bribe or kickback under any circumstances is wrong and that under no circumstances can its recognition as a legitimate expense of doing business be justified.

The actual distribution of the bribes and kickbacks as recognized by the Treasury Department as having been paid by this company to Mr. Rogers for his own personal use and for distribution to the dictatorship is as follows:

First contract:	
1949.....	\$436,000
1950.....	136,000
1951.....	28,000
1952.....	100,000
Total.....	700,000
Second contract and extension:	
1951.....	\$275,000
1952.....	544,000
1953.....	121,000
1954.....	148,000
1955.....	21,000
Total.....	1,109,000

Unquestionably the overwhelming majority of American corporations doing business abroad would refuse to cooperate in such holdup practices even if the demands were made of them.

Nevertheless, as in the instance outlined here, the situation does exist in which this practice has been followed, and we are advised that as the courts place interpretation upon the existing law such payments, either as kickbacks or bribes, can be deducted for income-

tax purposes as ordinary and necessary expenses of doing business.

Therefore, the burden now comes back to the Congress and the Treasury Department to support the necessary corrective legislation, thereby definitely both rejecting the principle and correcting the law.

All of the above referred to amounts were allowed by the Treasury Department as "ordinary and necessary" business expenses and thereby deductible for income tax purposes.

In the Treasury Department's letter, as incorporated in the RECORD on July 23, 1957, they stated:

Where * * * it is the foreign government itself which demands or acquiesces in the payment, so that legal recourse is not available to the taxpayer in the operation of his legal business, the Service would find it difficult to sustain the position that the expenses were not ordinary and necessary to the taxpayer's business.

In subsequent conversations with the Department and with the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation it has been agreed that in order to stop this practice additional legislation is required.

I am therefore today proposing an amendment to H. R. 8381, the purpose of which amendment is to prohibit the allowance as legitimate business deductions the payment of any bribe or kickback to officials or employees of foreign governments. There is already a law which prohibits such allowances on bribes or kickbacks paid to anyone within our country.

I ask that the amendment be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 6 after line 9 insert the following new section:

"That section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to trade or business expenses) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d), and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) Improper payments to officials or employees of foreign countries: No deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for any expense paid or incurred if the payment thereof is made, directly or indirectly, to an official or employee of a foreign country, and if the receipt of the payment would be unlawful under the laws of the United States if such laws were applicable to such payment and to such official or employee."

"Sec. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be applicable only with respect to expenses paid or incurred after the date of the enactment of this act. The determination as to whether any expense paid or incurred prior to the date of the enactment of this act shall be deductible shall be made as if this act had not been enacted and without inference drawn from the fact that this section is not expressly made applicable with respect to expenses paid or incurred prior to the date of the enactment of this act."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, to recognize these bribes or kickbacks as legitimate business deductions under the guise of ordinary and necessary busi-

ness expenses is in effect to condone the practice.

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee I shall urge the prompt adoption and acceptance of this amendment by Congress. Certainly our Government cannot afford to be on record as recognizing under any circumstances the legitimacy or the propriety of an American corporation or individual bribing an official or employee of a foreign government when soliciting contracts with that country.

It is my understanding that the Dominican Republic officials referred to as having received the bribes or kickbacks have upon inquiry denied the payments; however, company officials insist that the payments were made and describe them as being for the officials as outlined.

This contradiction further emphasizes my contention that under no circumstances should the United States Government ever recognize or condone the payment of bribes or kickbacks since obviously even if the moral character of the transaction were ignored, no company or individual can certify or prove the payment of cash bribes. No one would be fool enough to give receipts for bribery which was paid in cash.

Certainly, to say the least, the allowance of such cash bribes as legitimate business expenses for income-tax purposes is a far cry from the recent Treasury announcement demanding from the average taxpayer a complete itemized breakdown of every expense item.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as cosponsor of the bill (S. 3194) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to establish an initial program of tax adjustment for small and independent business and for persons engaged in small and independent business, which bill was introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in behalf of himself and other Senators on January 30, 1958.

First of all, let me congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business for this excellent bill which in its 49 pages makes a frontal attack on some pressing problems of small business.

The bill, as its sponsors indicate, is not intended as a comprehensive and complete solution of all the difficulties of small business which should be the concern of the Congress.

I say it is our concern because with bipartisan accord we have promised in our party platforms to study and solve the handicaps of new and small business.

I say it is our concern because the Congress, through its studies, is impressed with the compelling reasons for adjustment of tax burdens on new and small business.

And now the committee under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], from its travels of thousands of miles and its

consultation with hundreds and hundreds of small-business men in their home areas in every part of our land, has adduced the evidence and information which serves as the basis for this practical and profitable legislation.

The bill is practical because it helps to meet the need of small business to retain some part of its earnings to insure stability and growth. The bill is profitable to our country because this help to small business is truly an investment in our economy—strengthening our communities in peace—improving our ability to meet the demands of defense.

If I enumerate, in brief, some of the factors of this bill, it is not in explanation but in appreciation of the workmanship of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The bill permits an exemption from Federal income tax of a specific amount of net income before taxes, which exemption will be plowed back into the business for stability and expansion.

It extends retirement provisions to persons not now included.

It permits installment payments on Federal estate taxes so that the resources of a small business would not be drained in a single year.

It extends to used equipment the depreciation rates now applicable to new equipment; it being considered that small business with its limited capital cannot buy high-priced new equipment.

It permits corporations an election to be taxed as partnerships avoiding the inequity of double income taxation.

It increases the minimum accumulated earnings credit from \$60,000 to \$100,000 which is a recognition of inflation. And it avoids conflicting decisions in tax cases by making the findings of the Tax Court of the United States or the United States courts of appeals binding upon the Secretary of the Treasury unless the Treasury chose to appeal.

Perfection is not claimed for this bill nor is the small-business job completed, but surely a major and a master step has been taken and it is a privilege to be permitted to be a cosponsor of the most praiseworthy product of the work of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

I thank my colleagues.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED TAX REDUCTION ACT OF 1958—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 10, 1958, the names of Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. NEUBERGER were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3263) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to reduce the rate applicable to the first \$1,000 of taxable income for taxable year 1958 and to repeal or reduce certain excise taxes, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. CARROLL), on February 10, 1958.

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 10, 1958, the names of Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. NEUBERGER were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3264) to amend

the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to increase the amount of the personal exemption for taxable year 1958 and to repeal or reduce certain excise taxes, introduced on February 10, 1958, by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. CARROLL).

ACTIVITIES OF INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION IN FIELD OF AIRPORT ECONOMICS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 6, 1958, the names of Mr. LONG, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. MAGNUSON were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 258) relating to the participation of the United States in the activities of the International Civil Aviation Organization in the field of airport economics, submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. KENNEDY) on February 6, 1958.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Lincoln Day address delivered by him at Los Angeles, Calif., on February 12, 1958.

By Mr. BEALL:

Address delivered by him on January 23, 1958, upon receipt of the first Distinguished Service Award of the Washington Junior Chamber of Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Address by Senator CASE of New Jersey, delivered at dedication of a new building at Union Junior College, Cranford, N. J., on February 9, 1958.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address entitled "America's Abundance and World Needs," by Senator PROXMIER before the Church World Service luncheon, Statler Hotel, December 5, 1957.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Transcript of proceedings of Dedicatory Prayer Breakfast at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on February 6, 1958.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CONFESSIONS AND POLICE DETENTION BY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, has to be out of the city this week on other official Senate business, but has requested that an announcement be made at this time on forthcoming public hearings by the subcommittee.

The Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee will conduct public hearings on the subject, Confessions and Police Detention, on Friday, March 7, 1958, and Tuesday, March 11, 1958, beginning at 10:30 a. m., in room 457, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C. This subject has been studied for some time by the subcommittee, as noted in Senate Report No. 23 last year and Senate Re-

port No. 1203 this year, and these are the first practicable dates for holding hearings.

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULING OF HEARINGS ON S. 1870, RELATING TO THE RENDITION OF MUSICAL COMPOSITIONS ON COIN-OPERATED MACHINES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the hearings previously scheduled to commence on Wednesday, February 19, and to continue through Friday, February 21, 1958, on S. 1870, a bill to amend section 1 (e) of title 17 of the United States Code with regard to the rendition of musical compositions on coin-operated machines, have been rescheduled to commence at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Wednesday, April 9, and to continue through Friday, April 11, 1958.

The necessity for the rescheduling of these hearings is occasioned by a conflict in dates. The Subcommittee on Anti-trust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, has already commenced hearings which are now scheduled to run into the time when the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights was to have held hearings on S. 1870. It is believed, therefore, that the hearings already commenced should be concluded prior to entering upon hearings not actually begun.

At the hearings on S. 1870 all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself, chairman.

THE FRENCH ATTACK UPON SAKIET-SIDI-YOUSSEF

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the bombing attack on the Tunisian village of Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef was shocking. It was wholly unworthy of the great traditions of France. I cannot believe that it was an act of the French people, a people whose sense of humanity and decency is as high as that of any other people in the world. I cannot believe that it was a responsible act of the present French Republic. For all its difficulties, French officials in Paris cannot have lost their awareness of right and wrong. They cannot have so forgotten their righteous wrath at the reprisals taken against France during World War II as now to sanction the use of the same methods against others.

This attack on the helpless in a Tunisian village was not an act of France and the French people. It was an act of madness perpetrated by a handful of irresponsible men who have splattered the very flag they purport to represent, the very uniform they wear.

No matter what is done now, it will not restore the innocent dead in Tunisia. To be sure, we can and should deplore the incident. To be sure, this country can and should express deep regrets, the

more so since some of the planes that carried out the attack were of American manufacture.

Even more, however, we can act. We can adjust our policies in a manner which will help to move the situation in north Africa from the brink of chaos to a position of peace. The question now is to find a means out of the impasse in which this grave incident has placed France and Tunisia, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the whole Western World in its relations with Arab peoples, especially with those of north Africa who are closest to the West in outlook.

The key to the difficulty, and the basic cause of the present incident, is Algeria. Recent statements issued by the Algerian national liberation front show a growing hostility to the United States. The front now demands that our bases be reassessed—in other words, be removed from north Africa. This means, of course, the bases in Libya and Morocco. If this demand were to be fulfilled, it would mean that NATO would be in grave danger of encirclement; it would mean that Cairo would become the dominant Arab base in north Africa; and it would mean that the way for further intensive Soviet penetration would be paved.

In these circumstances, we cannot divorce ourselves from what is occurring in north Africa. So long as the dispute in that region involved only France and the Algerian nationalists, that might have been possible. It is no longer possible. The bombing incident in Tunisia has turned the dispute into a situation with worldwide implications which involve us and our policies in many ways.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the United States must align its policies on north Africa, not with the policies of those who have committed this act in Tunisia, but with the finest sentiments of the French people and those of other free people throughout the world. In the case of the immediate incident, this means that if the matter is referred to the United Nations, and once the facts are established: First, this country should support, in the United Nations, and by diplomacy, the claims of the innocent against those who bombed, for damages to property and persons, as a result of the raid on Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef, as well as other appropriate remedies; second, this country should support the establishment along both the Tunisian-Algerian and the Moroccan-Algerian border of limited nations emergency patrols, similar to those which have functioned so effectively on the Israeli-Egyptian frontier.

These are, at best, suggestions designed to prevent a further deterioration of the situation in north Africa. The need is deeper. The need still is for peace in Algeria—a peace that satisfies the decent people of that region and of France, even if it does not please those who rain death with the terrorist grenade or the bombing plane. Such a settlement could be based on acceptance of the principle that all who live permanently in Algeria have equal rights and equal obligations. At this late date, it may well be that it will take more than the French and the Al-

gerians to work out that kind of solution in Algeria. It may well take the good offices of those who, disinterested in the immediate situation, desire the friendship of both, and whose friendship is sought by both.

If this can be done, I express the hope that the Franco-Tunisian affair and the question of Algeria can be settled outside the United Nations, by the interested parties themselves. If this hope can become a fact, it will be in the best interests of those immediately concerned, as well as the best interests of those at a distance who are concerned. Time is of the essence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, tragedy befell Tunisia and the cause of freedom last Saturday. In a single act of idiocy, the Tunisian market town of Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef was the victim of a premeditated attack by French fliers using American-made planes, raining death and destruction on the town hall, the post office, a school, 84 shops, and 2 Red Cross trucks carrying Swiss license plates. A total of 68 persons dead, including women and children, and a hundred wounded were left when the B-26's and Corsairs retired across the border into that other scene of terror and death, Algeria.

We have been wringing our hands over French colonial policies for years. We wrung our hands over them during the bloody holocaust of Indochina, and there proved to be no solution for that problem until the French themselves gradually tired of the accumulation of bitterness and bloodshed, tears, and treasure, which that fruitless holding operation cost.

But the lessons of Indochina apparently have not been learned in north Africa. Many of us for months have hoped against hope that a decent basis of close and enduring relations could be forged by the French and her former north African possessions. The natural interests of Morocco and Tunisia still lie in a close association with France. The chances of salvaging anything constructive from the Algerian crisis also lie, or lay until last weekend, with enlightened compromise from Paris.

The quagmire of Algeria has seemed unending enough. Against increasing pressure of world opinion, including liberal opinion in France itself, the French Government has insisted on treating Algeria as a domestic matter. But the desperate and hotheaded action of the French Air Force last Saturday is almost a transparent indication that the French are determined to act against their own best interests.

The Tunisian market day bombing has done more than anything before to internationalize the Algerian problem, precisely the thing Paris has been trying to avoid.

Like a stone dropped into a huge pond, the ever-widening ripples from the Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef bombing are spreading out to ever greater catastrophe for the entire western position and to ever greater possibilities for Soviet diplomacy.

The President of Tunisia, Habib Bourguiba, has been desperately trying to maintain his friendship for the West in recent months. A week ago, before

the bombing, he said that he needed something more than the pretty eyes of Mr. Dulles to maintain that relationship. Tuesday, Mr. Bourguiba's *Destour* Party newspaper said:

Hard reality is teaching us each day that to hang on to the West only produces a harvest of rebuffs and humiliations and, between gestures of charity, bombs. For the B-26's and Corsairs which sowed death Saturday morning were American as much as they were French. One thing is clear. To be respected in 1958 means one must no longer be a friend of the West.

We cannot wring our hands on such matters forever, disagreeable as it always is to talk man to man with one of our closest allies about a problem as explosive and sensitive as this one. Nevertheless, it is time for such a man-to-man talk with our French friends. What we must tell them is also, I think, quite clear:

It is always a cruel process to relinquish an empire, but some ways of doing it are better than others. Indochina proved a tragic military holocaust. Algeria has already become another.

France is not the only western power which has an interest in the development of stable, peaceful governments in north Africa. The interests of NATO, and more than that, the interests of the Free World, demand positive, constructive steps to solve the north African colonial controversy. We in the United States, and the other good friends of France in the West, do not intend to allow ourselves to be drawn along with French policy into a descending spiral of hatred and hopelessness in north Africa. That is what needs to be said to our French allies.

A famous Frenchman, Clemenceau, once said that war was too serious an affair to be entrusted to generals. French generals have just proved this once more.

The strategic, political, and moral position of the West is far too important to be tied to the kite of French military decisions for which even the French Foreign Office disclaims responsibility. We are not prepared to sacrifice the friendship of a Bourguiba at the whim of a handful of French pilots with lethal weapons in their hands.

The world is not interested in explanations from Paris at the moment. It is interested in amends.

The United States, in its own best interests and in the interests of the Free World, will no longer pull French chestnuts out of the fire at the United Nations on the Algerian question.

Mr. President, just as we are interested in amends for the Tunisian attack, so we are interested in a fair and constructive settlement of the Algerian issue. We should support inclusion of this item on the United Nations agenda, and redouble our efforts to conciliate and mediate.

I would go further. Under our NATO arrangements with France, France has no right to use equipment furnished for NATO defense in the manner in which the planes were used last Saturday. I have checked at the State Department, only to learn that the B-26's used in the attack were apparently purchased by France, without any strings attached.

The F4U7 Corsairs, however, were apparently donated to France under our mutual defense assistance program, which provides that the equipment shall be used for NATO purposes.

I am one of those who feel we should have raised with the French long ago this question of the use of NATO equipment in Algeria. The French have always claimed that Algeria was within the NATO sphere, however, and for that reason the State Department has never protested. But Tunisia is not in the NATO area, and I think the question should now be raised.

Under section 511 (c) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, the United States has reserved the right to request the return of NATO equipment donated by us when it is no longer needed for the purpose intended. The use of the Corsairs in the Tunisian attack is *prima facie* evidence, as far as I am concerned, that this equipment is not considered by the French to be needed for NATO purposes. I respectfully suggest that the President, through the Secretary of State, inform the French Government that the NATO equipment used in last Saturday's attack be returned to the United States for disposition elsewhere in conformance with NATO objectives.

I also hope, Mr. President, we have conveyed our heartfelt sympathy to the people of Tunisia, and, may I say, renewed our bonds of friendship to the President of Tunisia.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have listened with the greatest interest, because of my own concern with our Nation's foreign policy, to the remarks this morning of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], on the subject of the French bombing of a village in Tunisia.

I believe we must be very precise on this subject, as my colleagues have tried to be. We must be precise in this way, namely, that we need a specific policy for our country.

There appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, on February 11, an editorial entitled "A Sad Error," which I ask unanimous consent to have made a part of my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SAD ERROR

The whole Free World will agree with French Foreign Minister Pineau that the bombing of a Tunisian village was a "sad error." It is an error that cost the lives of 74 civilians and injured 102 others. Moreover, the Foreign Minister himself now concedes that General Salan's communique—claiming that only military objectives were hit—"does not correspond to the facts."

"There is no doubt, I'm afraid," Mr. Pineau told Joseph Alsop, "that almost the whole village was destroyed."

President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles have expressed the deep concern that all Americans feel over this tragedy, particularly since United States-built planes were used in the raids. Senator KNOWLAND, noting that Tunisia is a member of the U. N., spoke the feeling of many in saying: "The U. N. cannot have one rule for small aggressors and another for the large ones."

The one cheering note in what is otherwise a ghastly mess is that the French Government itself was apparently not aware of the planned operation. It may seem unlikely that this could happen, but actually it did occur in a situation as confused as the Tunisian war.

Because French forces are frequently attacked by rebels who flee into Tunisia as a "protected sanctuary," the French some time ago authorized "hot pursuit" in Tunisian border areas. A French patrol was shot up 3 weeks ago near Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef with 15 dead and 4 kidnaped. An electrified barbed wire fence was set up at the border; in the past 10 days 3 planes patrolling it have been struck, over Algeria, by heavy machinegun fire from inside Tunisia. What may have happened is that a mission was authorized to wipe out the machinegun nest, but that the men who carried it out exceeded their orders. It must be borne in mind that some of them have been fighting for 10 years, have bitter memories of the Chinese "sanctuary" which protected Ho Chi Minh's forces in Indochina, and also have an understandable hatred toward those who have killed so many of their comrades. This, of course, does not justify what was done; it does help explain it.

The wisest thing for the French Government to do now is to admit its error, to make public apologies for it, and to take swift action to pay damages to Tunisia and to provide other relief for the survivors. By the same token President Bourguiba should police his own borders more effectively, halt the shooting at French planes, and stop giving sanctuary to rebels.

The President has already dispatched our Ambassador to Tunisia, G. Lewis Jones, to inspect the bombed village. He and Secretary Dulles have discussed, among other things, a U. N. observation team to police this troubled border. Something of this sort certainly ought to be attempted, and soon.

The most tragic aspect of this business is the free ride it gives to Nasser and all other hate-the-west propagandists being manipulated by Soviet experts.

Because of this it would be well for the United States to do everything in its power to help the stricken people of Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef. We urge the President to send planes with food, clothing and medical supplies, and treat it as a disaster area. For what happened there was certainly a disaster—for the people of the village, and for the whole Free World.

Mr. JAVITS. As the editorial states, we should at least show our sympathy by direct aid to the people who have been bereaved.

The other way to do it is this—and again I say we must be precise in this regard: Whatever the American policy has been in the past, it must now be changed to provide that we use every organization of Government to bring about mediation of this dispute in the United Nations.

I still think the United Nations, which was effective in Indonesia, which was effective in Palestine, and which was effective in other areas of the world, can be effective in this Tunisian situation here.

At one time we voted against the consideration of this issue by the General Assembly. We have to be foursquare about it. We have to make as a major item of Government policy the fact that every organ of the United Nations should be used to bring about the end of this dispute.

This is a clear and precise precedent, and demands an orderly policy on the part of the United States. Nothing else will do. There seems to be, in my opinion, no quicker or better method of approach.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE PROCLAMATION OF LITHUANIA

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, nearly 18 years have passed since the barbaric hordes of Soviet Russia swept through Lithuania, a small but significant land of freedom, and reduced it to a slave state incorporated into the Communist empire. At this time, however, let us note a happier occasion in the history of Lithuania, for it was 40 years ago that her freedom-loving peoples proclaimed their independence.

There is a tie between these two events, a most important tie. For the spirit which prompted the event of 40 years ago, the proclamation of independence, daily threatens the more recent development, that of enslavement by Russia. Sooner or later, that spirit will again prevail, and Lithuanians will once again know liberty's blessings.

The United States has never recognized the illegal seizure of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union. Thus, as we pause to commemorate the 40th anniversary of Lithuania's independence declaration, let us remind the world that this great Nation continues to regard the Baltic States as sovereign nations, looking to the day when they will again be as independent in fact as they are today in the hearts of their peoples.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on the 16th of February millions of American hearts will turn with a longing toward Lithuania. That date will be an anniversary of independence of a country no longer free, but of a people who, having known suffering and subjugation through dark pages of history, have faith and hope that the justice of a brighter hour will return again.

The same history proves the Lithuanians a race of character, culture, and courage. They cling to the glories of their language and they maintain the traditions that have been theirs since before the Christian era.

Americans of every race share both the sorrow and the aspirations of the people of Lithuania. For America is grateful for the contributions that men and women of Lithuanian blood have made to our common strength.

In the first and succeeding generations, in our schools and sports, our professions and our Armed Forces, every State has a proud record of the boys and girls who have achieved fame for themselves and for America.

We salute Lithuania, which became an independent land four centuries before America was discovered. We sympathize with Lithuania, which lost its independence in 1795, even as these United States started on their journey. We look back to February 16, 1918, when Lithuania stood forth an independent nation once again. And again we sorrow in the distress of these past 18 years,

when the heel of the conqueror and the broken promises of great nations bring oppression to a great people.

They have a faith that the Soviet can never destroy. They have a courage that the Soviet can never vanquish. Lithuania has a character that will survive when all the fraud and force and fear of Godless tyrants will have vanished from the face of the earth. Loyal Lithuania, we salute you on your independence day, and we pray for the day when you shall truly be free.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, the year 1918 gave birth to a large number of new national states. Many of these were subdued long ago and were submerged within large and inclusive empires, and for centuries they had ceased to be independent and sovereign nations. In Europe alone there were half of a dozen such national groups: the Czechs, Poles, and Ukrainians, Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were among these. And, as the First World War was drawing to its close, many of these national groups proclaimed their independence, attained their freedom, and became sovereign states. Among them was the Republic of Lithuania.

Prior to that date, for more than a hundred years, Lithuanians were brought under the rule of Russia, and as subjects of autocratic czars they suffered all sorts of hardships, yet under most oppressive conditions they managed to preserve many of their national traditions and clung steadfastly to the idea of national freedom and independence. In 1918, when that autocratic regime was shattered, they proclaimed their independence on February 16.

Today, we paid tribute to Lithuania and the 40th anniversary of that great historic event. Even though, and most unfortunately, that independence is no more and liberty-loving Lithuanians have been suffering, for more than 17 years, under totalitarian tyranny, yet that day remains as a living symbol for all Lithuanians, particularly for those living under Communist bondage in their native land. Under tyranny and indescribable hardships they cannot observe this memorable day, but they all pray for the regaining of their freedom. In observing this day, the Lithuanian Independence Day, we echo their genuine sentiments and ardently hope that some day and soon they will celebrate their independence day in their beloved homeland.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to add my comments to those of other Senators in paying tribute to the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, an independence relatively short lived in fact, but long lived and living forever in the hearts of those who cherish liberty above enslavement, and freedom above the tyranny imposed by imperialistic masters. Those who, like my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], and my other colleagues, who commemorate this event in the United States are performing a dual service—they keep fresh in the memory of Americans a small country whose liberty was forfeited through agreement between Nazi and Communist totalitarian powers, and they remind the world

that Lithuanian independence is a real expectation for the future more than a mere memory of the past.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, Sunday, February 16, is the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Lithuania. We in America are proud to join with free Lithuanians everywhere in the celebration of this glorious day. Although their nation was treacherously seized by Russia, the courageous Lithuanian people have not conceded that the Soviet tyranny is anything more than a temporary phenomenon.

To these brave people, who made such magnificent strides as a free nation, we extend our deepest sympathy and friendship; and we hope with all of them that the day when once again they will be welcomed into the family of free nations will soon dawn.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, February 16, 1958, marks the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. It is a sad day of commemoration, for the light of liberty, rekindled just 40 years ago, and shining so brightly, was extinguished once more on June 15, 1940. It was then that brave Lithuania was occupied by Soviet Russian forces. This was in direct violation of the treaty of 1926. This was in direct violation of all treaties—the peace pact, the nonaggression pact, and the mutual assistance pact with Russia with a guarantee of Lithuanian independence and of Russian noninterference in the domestic, social, and economic order of that country—a treaty which is still in force between Lithuania and Soviet Russia.

Since that dark day of June in 1940, literally hundreds of thousands of innocent men, women, and children have been either brutally deported to Soviet labor camps or have been annihilated. The population of Lithuania, through these inhuman methods, has been reduced from around 3,000,000 to half of that number.

Lithuanian statehood dates back to the year 1200 A. D. It has a magnificent historical record of tolerance, of individual and cultural liberty. Throughout the centuries the heroic sacrifices of the Lithuanian people have been made for basic human rights, for human dignity, for freedom of the press and religion.

First under Nazi domination and then under Soviet oppression, the light of liberty has been dimmed. It still flickers, however, and will some day flare into brilliance as it has in the past. Lithuanian history is rife with a constant war for freedom. During the Middle Ages Lithuania was a powerful state. She successfully defended herself against the Germans, the Mongols, and the Tartars. Finally in 1795, Lithuania lost her freedom to czarist Russia. From that date until 1918 Lithuania was at constant war with Russia and Germany to regain her lost liberty and freedom.

On February 16, 1918, the United States, Russia, Germany, and other nations recognized the independence of Lithuania, with Russia giving up all claims to that nation.

It was during these few short years of freedom that Lithuania contributed so

much of culture and industry to the world. Today her industries have been depleted and ravaged. Her culture lies prostrate under the heel of a cruel dictatorship which hopes to stamp out her national life forever. Her young people are forced into Communist schools. Her young men are impressed into the Russian armed forces. Her religious life is all but extinct.

But despite this sad and shocking picture, all hope is not lost for these brave people. History has shown that any regime built on a foundation of the murder, pillage, and misery of innocent people cannot and will not endure.

As we join today with all Lithuanian-Americans in commemorating this 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, we give thanks for the enrichment of our own beloved country by the fierce love for liberty each has inherited and by the skills which they have so generously contributed to our own welfare.

May all of us join our prayers to their own that the day of deliverance for Lithuania will soon be realized and that the light of freedom will glow once more over that land.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Sunday, February 16, will mark the 40th anniversary of the formation of a free and independent government in Lithuania. This liberty-loving nation is now under Soviet domination and its people are unable to observe this anniversary, and it is fitting that the Congress of the United States should remind the Free World nations of the bravery and courage of the Lithuanian people.

The free government of the Republic of Lithuania was established February 16, 1918, as a direct result of President Woodrow Wilson's famous Declaration of 14 Points, which expressed the principle of national self-determination.

The establishment of the republic marked the end of 123 years of Lithuanian servitude to Imperial Russian rule. However, the republic enjoyed only 22 years of free national creative expression, and then was cruelly invaded by the Soviet Army, bringing a new Russian imperialism and Communist tyranny to this struggling nation.

As freedom-loving people, we Americans have an obligation to insist that Soviet Russia restore the independence and national sovereignty of the Republic, and I urge that the Department of State remain steadfast in refusing recognition to the Soviet annexation of Lithuania.

Also, here in America we are proud of the high cultural attainments and contributions to the Nation's welfare by Lithuanian Americans and their preservation of the cultural heritage of Lithuania, whose language and literature are among the oldest in the Western World. We extend to them and to Lithuanians everywhere our sincere best wishes and hopes that once again the Republic of Lithuania will take its rightful place in the ranks of the free nations of the world.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared commemorating the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

Sunday, February 16, will mark the 40th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania. This anniversary serves to focus our attention once again on the fact that since 1940 Lithuania has been unable to enjoy the rights and privileges of a free nation.

Lithuania's tragedy is representative of the great plight of our time—the sinister domination of small and independent nations by an imperialistic Soviet conspiracy, a conspiracy which is subtle because it is masked by the perverted ideals of international communism, but a conspiracy which is also all too overt, as was demonstrated over a year ago in Hungary.

May we never forget that the Lithuanian people were once free. To forget would be inviting disaster. To forget would be preparing the way for a similar tragedy of our own. Instead, let us in America always remember that the spirit of liberty continues to live in the hearts of these valiant people.

It is only fitting that we join with the million Americans of Lithuanian descent in commemorating this anniversary of their independence. It is with heavy heart that we take cognizance of the present plight of their homeland, but it is with hope and determination that we dedicate ourselves to a future which will witness the rebirth of independence in Lithuania and the other enslaved nations of the world.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, it is with a heavy but also a hopeful heart that I rise today to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that Sunday, February 16, will mark the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

My heart is heavy, because the independence of that gallant nation was so short lived. But at the same time, my heart is hopeful, because history teaches us that slavery will not endure forever.

History also teaches us, Mr. President, that freedom is indivisible. So long as any part of the human race is denied its freedom, the rest of the human race will not be entirely secure in its freedom.

The spirit is stronger than the sword. Although the Lithuanian nation is today in the grip of a foreign tyrant, the Lithuanian spirit is as undaunted and untrammled as ever.

So long as this spirit survives, so long as faith lasts, there will be grounds for hope, regardless of how distant the day of liberation may be.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is felicitous that Bishop Brizgys, of the Lithuanian Church, should have been with us this morning to open the Senate session with prayer.

This week marks the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Though the Lithuanian people have not known freedom for 18 years, their claim to independence has never been broken by the long interval of Russian oppression. The United States has never accorded diplomatic acknowledgment to the Russian annexation of this Baltic State. Through the Voice of America and our refugee programs, we have continued to recognize the distinctive national heritage and existence of Lithuania. Long as have been the years of Lithuanian submergence, we cannot slacken in our determination that the national and cultural ideals of Lithuania be reinforced

by a political restoration. On February 16, 1918, more than one century of Russian domination came to an end. Forty years later we must once again remember that the vital spark of freedom has not been extinguished among Lithuanians. Their cause remains our cause and their hopes more than ever remain our responsibility.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point the text of a letter recently delivered to President Eisenhower on behalf of the national Lithuanian-American student and youth organizations.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 16, 1958.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: On the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the restoration of the Lithuanian independence we wish respectfully to point out the lesson of the experience of the Baltic States in general and of Lithuania in particular in their relations with the Soviet Union during the interwar period. This experience conclusively shows the vain hopes of the possibility of peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union. It gives incontrovertible evidence of the continuous disregard by the Soviet Union of its solemn international commitments and agreements. Despite the treaties of peace and friendship and of non-aggression concluded with the Baltic States and solemn assurances of noninterference in their domestic affairs, the Soviet Union, in flagrant violation of these treaties, obligations, and pledges invaded the Baltic countries and forcibly incorporated them into the U. S. S. R.

Neither the United States nor any other free country has ever recognized this act of violence. On the contrary they denounced it for what it actually was—and act of brutal aggression in complete disregard of international law and Soviet commitments. The policy of nonrecognition by the leaders of the Free World of these illegal acts of the Soviet Union continues to give a ray of hope to all of the Soviet enslaved nations and maintains their spirit of resistance to the Soviet oppression.

On our part we clearly see the close relationship which exists between the United States policy not to recognize the effects of these acts of aggression committed by the Soviet Union in the Baltic States and the possibility of the restoration of their independence. We hold that any recognition of the present status quo in the Baltic countries by the United States could imply the recognition of the results of a flagrant violation of international law and justice. This should not be done inasmuch as the length of oppression does not change the illegal nature of the Soviet crime, nor make it acceptable to the enslaved peoples, nor finally provide any legal or moral grounds to justify an act of violence.

There is no doubt in our minds that the United States, as the leading power in the Free World is not going to change its longstanding position in regard to the perfidious actions of the Soviet Union in the Baltic area. To the contrary we firmly believe that the United States as the moral leader of the Free World will support by all possible means the struggle of many millions of the enslaved peoples for freedom and for the righting of the international wrongs done by the Soviet Union.

It is also our firm conviction that the present position of leadership of the United States would be best strengthened through an unequivocal, clear, and positive restatement of the principles of freedom and of

the longstanding policy of nonrecognition of the Soviet domination in Eastern Europe in general and the occupation of the Baltic States in particular. The U. S. S. R. furthermore should be induced to withdraw its occupying forces and agents from the Baltic States and permit free elections under international control.

One of the effective ways to counteract the newest Soviet cold war offensive would be the intensification of a consistent, positive, and courageous policy of support of the struggle for freedom of the captive countries by the United States. Such policy should expose the real motives of the present Soviet peace offensive, reveal the true objectives of communism in the uncommitted countries, and remind the members of NATO the fate of the countries whose relations with the Soviet Union were not based on the position of strength and unity, backed by a well-organized collective defense. But most of all such United States policy would keep alive the hope and aspirations of the captive nations to regain their independence thereby weakening the political and economic power of the Soviet empire.

The 40th anniversary of the restoration of the Lithuanian independence and stanch fights of the Lithuanian people for their survival are important reminders to everyone that despite the foreign oppression liberty and justice under law are the most cherished principles and moral values. It is an excellent opportunity to all peoples to review their belief and struggle for the immediate implementation of human rights and freedom and due respect for treaties concluded under the international law. We hope that these principles would continue to be uncompromisingly adhered to by the governments of the Free World and established everywhere through the efforts of the free nations under the leadership of the United States.

We wholeheartedly support, Mr. President, your attitude toward the present situation in Eastern Europe, as expressed in your letter of January 12, 1958, to the Soviet Government. We respectfully ask you, Mr. President, to stand firmly on your proposals as stated in this letter, and to refuse to participate in a conference with the Soviet leaders, unless they agree to place on the conference agenda and to discuss the question of the independence of the Soviet captured countries of Eastern Europe, and particularly of the Baltic States.

Most respectfully yours,
THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NATIONAL
LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN STUDENT
AND YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, after more than a century of Russian occupation and three unsuccessful attempts at insurrection against the alien occupiers, the Republic of Lithuania proclaimed its independence at Vilna on February 16, 1918—40 short years ago.

The life of Lithuania as a free republic was uncommonly short. In the wake of the infamous Nazi-Soviet pact, Lithuania was engulfed by the Red tide of Communist power.

The United States has steadfastly refused to recognize the cowardly usurpation of the sovereignty of the Lithuanian Republic by the Soviet Union; thus, officially, Lithuania lives on in spite of its fate at the hands of a brutal oppressor.

In a historical sense, it would be difficult to match Lithuania's tribulations with those of any other country on earth. Yet, despite all the suffering and misery, the Lithuanian spirit remained unbroken. Even today, under the tyrannical

ny of the most cruel of all oppressors, the Lithuanian nation manages to keep the precious light of liberty aflame in the bosoms of her sons and daughters.

It is only fitting that the people of United States join free Lithuanians everywhere in commemorating the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of the Lithuanian Republic. I believe I express the conviction of us all that the tribulations of the Lithuanian people will soon come to an end and that an independent and sovereign Republic of Lithuania will again be able to take its rightful position among the free nations of this world.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the million Americans of Lithuanian descent and, indeed, with freedom-loving peoples throughout the world, in paying tribute to the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. We who enjoy the priceless gift of freedom must speak on this occasion for a nation which has been silenced by tyranny.

A tragic twist of history has made Lithuanian independence short-lived. In the 13th century a dozen or so principalities were united into a small nation which, in the following centuries, endured the almost constant encroachments of other, far larger countries. Throughout this dark period the hope of eventual independence burned brightly, and finally, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania's dream of a free independent state came true.

For a period of some 22 years Lithuania proudly occupied a place of honor among the free nations of the world. For the first time, her political, social, economic and cultural institutions were permitted to flower without interference or subjection. Lithuania's land reform law of 1922 was the first in all Europe. Universal compulsory education reduced illiteracy, the ally of all oppressors, from 64 to 15 percent.

Her standards of commerce, agriculture and industry rose. The arts flourished in an atmosphere of peace and liberty.

And then, in 1940, Soviet Russia annexed Lithuania and her neighboring Baltic States. Rigid censorship has blacked out the struggles of Lithuania against oppression. But we know that since the incorporation of this tiny nation within the U. S. S. R., more than half a million Lithuanians have become the victims of Soviet mass murder, and thousands more go each month into exile or slave labor camps. These grim statistics point to the determination of Lithuanians to resist oppression and to their indomitable courage in the face of terrible odds. The 3 million silent Lithuanians still in their homeland may not hear us directly today. But perhaps some, through the broadcasts of a free world, will know that we fervently hope that one day Lithuanians everywhere may live again under a system of humanity and justice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, February 16 will mark the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Lithuania. Since that memorable event we have seen this brave

country enslaved and the dream of its people of a free and independent republic crushed by the Soviets. In these dark and cynical times many fail to appreciate the effect that the continuing struggle of the Lithuanian people has on the world and, indeed, it may appear that they are struggling against insuperable odds. However, dictators may come and go but where the love of freedom exists in the hearts of men it is the dictator that must eventually fall. It is essential to the preservation of our free society that we do not overlook the suffering and privations of the Lithuanian people.

The illegal seizure of the Baltic States by the Soviets can never be condoned and that black page in history can never be made clean unless and until those states are made free again. We fervently pray that that day will come soon.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE CENTRAL PORTION OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have been very much encouraged by the shafts of light which recently have been focused on the little-known plans which would substantially alter the most outstanding architectural structure in this country—the original Capitol Building. I am constantly amazed at the number of people who are completely ignorant of the proposed project. I may add that they include a goodly number of the Members of Congress. For this reason, I am particularly pleased when the citizenry are alerted to the fact that the historic east front of the Capitol is in jeopardy; and I am very glad that on February 17, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is to hold hearings which will enable some of our outstanding architects and citizens to outline for us the nature of the jeopardy.

Because of my concern over this matter, I introduced on August 29, 1957, a bill (S. 2883) to amend the Legislative Appropriations Act of 1956, to eliminate the requirement that the extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the central portion of the Capitol be in substantial accord with scheme B of the architectural plan of March 3, 1905. Cosponsoring this bill with me was my colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Therefore, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a letter, which appeared in the New York Times on February 10, 1958, written by one of this country's most distinguished architects, Mr. Lorimer Rich, F. A. I. A., architect of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and the monumental approaches to the Amphitheater in Arlington National Cemetery. Because it is my feeling that my colleagues in the Senate, the Members of the House of Representatives, and the citizens in general would oppose any scheme which would destroy the east front of the Capitol, if they were aware of the plans to do so, I ask unanimous

consent that the letter be printed in the body of the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 10, 1958]

TO PRESERVE THE CAPITOL—NEW LEGISLATION TO SAVE FACADE OF EAST FRONT IS BACKED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

One hundred and sixty-five years ago George Washington laid the foundation stone for our National Capitol. General Washington said "It has grandeur, simplicity, and beauty." It was completed in 1829, the result of the genius of three of our early architects. Thornton, Latrobe, and Bulfinch. This central building stands today as approved by the Founders of the Republic.

This facade has looked down upon history. These stones have been the background for the inauguration of every President since Andrew Jackson. These steps have known the footprints of our early great—Webster, Clay, Calhoun. This portico has received the remains of our martyred Presidents—Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley. These are the walls viewed by our grandfathers as they assembled in the great plaza for the stirring Grand Army review of 1865. Surely, this setting should be preserved.

Today this symbol of our past is in danger of destruction. The Architect of the Capitol, who is not an architect, has recommended that the east front of the old Capitol be destroyed and a reproduction, in a different material, be built out from the present location. The reason given is that the Congress needed more space for committee rooms and dining halls.

ALTERNATE PLAN

Architects have devised a plan which provides for practically all the new requirements without moving out and destroying the east front. They propose to put the dining halls, committee rooms, and such, on the west side. However, the legislation as passed forbids this as the only new work to be done. It is a directive to provide space by the destruction of this historic memento.

The report of the consultants states that they were unable, because of the legislation, to do other than destroy the east front. They say it is "our considered belief that: the present beauty of the Capitol can be kept only by moving out the whole east front, wings and all, and not the central part alone." Unless the Congress can be persuaded to do otherwise, we will witness the destruction of the finest portion of this venerated building.

The legislation just mentioned was introduced and passed surreptitiously, without hearings. Authorization and appropriation were in the same bill. The American Institute of Architects has repeatedly protested this desecration.

Senators H. ALEXANDER SMITH, CLIFFORD P. CASE, HUBERT HUMPHREY, and JOSEPH CLARK have introduced a bill, S. 2883, which will free the architects from the requirement that they destroy these walls.

S. 2883 has been referred to the Subcommittee on Public Buildings of the Senate Committee on Public Works. Senator PAT McNAMARA is chairman of the subcommittee. Public hearings on this vital bill will be held on February 17.

The east front of the Capitol is historic. The first architectural structure of this Nation, it is a milestone in our history. The American people cherish it and wish it to be preserved.

LORIMER RICH, F. A. I. A.,
The Committee to Preserve the National Capitol.

WASHINGTON, February 5, 1958.

COMMEMORATION OF BIRTHDAY OF GEN. THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO, FEBRUARY 12

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in Lafayette Park in this city of Washington stands the statue of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko.

In that single sentence we do honor to three great comrades of our War for Independence. In that single sentence we tell of the challenge that the word "freedom" has for all men. And in that single sentence we begin to tell something of the debt that our America owes to the many races which gave their very lives for her freedom's cause.

Washington, Lafayette, and Kosciusko became comrades when the Declaration of Independence meant a declaration of war. Lafayette was only 19 years of age when he heard both declarations. Kosciusko was 28. Washington was 44. Lafayette brought the enthusiasm of youth. Kosciusko brought the fighting experience of a soldier and an engineer. Under the leadership of Washington the talents of the three reached a climax in the Battle of Monmouth, the turning point of the Revolution.

Kosciusko had something in common with another great American—Abraham Lincoln. Yesterday we marked the birthday of both.

The day does not lose any of its reverence for the Emancipator if we praise the Polish warrior for freedom. Kosciusko served throughout the Revolution. Then he returned to his native land to fight against Russia. Wounded, captured, imprisoned, and liberated, he returned to America in 1797 and the Congress acknowledged our debt with a pension and a grant of land. Upon his death he found an honored resting place in the Cathedral of Cracow. But the many memorials in America will constantly remind us how this son of Poland and the sons and daughters of Poland throughout all the years have done so much to prove these United States the land of the free and the home of the brave.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have noticed in the newspapers, having just returned to Washington today, that the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [HARRY F. BYRD], is to retire from the Senate, and will not seek reelection this year. We shall have an opportunity later, I am sure, to express our appreciation of HARRY BYRD; to state what a monument he has been and what an ornament he has been in the Senate of the United States, as well as what an example he has set for all of us in the way of public service. At this moment I only express my personal feeling of great admiration and affection for this great Senator and great statesman, and express my regret that we are nearing the end of the line so far as his service in the Senate of the United States is concerned.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it was with a sense of profound sadness

that I learned yesterday that the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] had reached a decision to retire from the Senate at the end of this year.

During the brief time I have been privileged to serve in this body, I have had many occasions to observe the brilliance of his intellect, the wisdom of his counsel, and his great devotion to our constitutional form of government.

It has been my good fortune to have had a close personal relationship with the Senator. His philosophy of government is a sound one, based on the fundamental principles that have guided this Nation since its earliest days. He has always been dedicated to clean, honest government, and his career stands as a monument to the highest principles of good government.

I fully appreciate the reasons why the Senator feels impelled to retire from public life. He has had a full career of public service and is surely entitled to a period of rest. Nevertheless, I cannot help hoping that the Senator will reconsider his decision. We do not have enough men like him in public life.

Assuming that his decision is irrevocable, I think I may also assume that he will continue to maintain his keen interest in public affairs and that, from time to time, he will give the country the benefit of his views.

History will record that the Senator was one of the greatest of 20th century Americans. Certainly he is second to none in his grasp of the intricate economics of government, the field which he has chosen to make his primary specialty. It is even more impressive, in my opinion, that he has become such a notable specialist while remaining so well informed in all areas of government.

The retirement of the Senator will leave a gap in the Senate that will be exceedingly hard to fill.

Former President Truman once remarked that there were "too many Byrds" on Capitol Hill. I am convinced that the country would be better off with more Byrds in the Senate and in other positions of high public responsibility.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as the minority leader, I would not want this occasion to pass without saying that I read with great regret the announcement by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] that he would retire from the Senate at the end of his term.

Senator HARRY BYRD has had a long and distinguished career in the interest of his State of Virginia and of the Nation.

He is at present the chairman of the very important and powerful Committee on Finance of the Senate, and for many years he has been one of the senior members of the Committee on Armed Services.

Senator BYRD has commanded the respect of Senators on both sides of the aisle, who have recognized him as a devoted public servant, a man of high personal integrity, and a man of great patriotism.

I know that Senator BYRD, when his term has finally been concluded, will be missed by all of his colleagues in the United States Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a letter written by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], expressing regret upon the announcement by Senator BYRD of his retirement from the United States Senate. The Senator from Colorado who is out of town, asked that his letter be included in the RECORD.

In placing this letter in the RECORD I join with the Senator from Colorado and other Senators in expressing regret that the Senator from Virginia will be retiring after this year.

Senator BYRD is recognized as the Senate's leading authority on Government finance. His integrity and high principles are examples for all of us to follow. Senator BYRD's retirement from the Senate represents a great loss to the Senate Finance Committee, of which he is chairman, as well as a loss to the Senate, his State, and our country. He will go down in history as one of America's great men.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 13, 1958.

The Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I have just read the announcement of your plan to retire and find it difficult to imagine the days ahead in the Senate without our most eminent colleague. It is unfair, of course, for any of us to begrudge you and your family a more leisurely life after so many, many years of dedicated public service.

I shall always count it among my greatest privileges to have served with you. I shall long remember your courage and integrity.

Best wishes for good health, happiness, and enjoyment of the years ahead for you and Mrs. Byrd.

Sincerely,

GORDON ALLOTT,
United States Senate.

MORALE IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, many of us remember that, of all the men who wore the American uniform in World War II, one managed more than any other to convey how our servicemen really felt. I refer to Bill Mauldin, the great GI cartoonist.

This week Bill Mauldin is back with a cartoon about our servicemen of today. It appears on the cover of Newsweek magazine; and it is a picture which, with the story, should disturb us all.

We remember Willie and Joe, the dirty, often discouraged, soldiers of Bill Mauldin's war cartoons. Well, Willie and Joe are not in this picture. Instead, there is simply a rifle stuck in the ground and on the rifle there is a sign that says: "Fed Up". Willie and Joe have finally just walked off the job; and so have most of their successors.

Morale in our Armed Forces has seldom, if ever, been lower; and the facts and figures prove it.

Fully one-third of our servicemen turn their backs on the service every year. Unless we act quickly, so many more will quit that we will face a crisis unparalleled in our history.

We will have missiles, planes, submarines, and other complicated war equipment, but nowhere near enough trained men to operate these machines.

We have forgotten the men behind our modern weapons. They have been turned into neglected citizens.

The time has come for us to ask ourselves whether we are wise, let alone have the right, to permit our servicemen to put up with conditions as they now exist in the Armed Forces.

All too often we are prone to look at this problem in terms of budgets and statistics. We know, for instance, that each day the Air Force and the Navy lose \$2 million in accidents, many of which can only result in unnecessary deaths.

Now I ask Senators to turn to the detailed worldwide survey of service morale in the current issue of Newsweek, and see these statistics as we should see them: in terms of men, American boys, our sons, and the sons of our friends and neighbors.

A fighter pilot talked about the mechanic working on his plane: "At \$160 a month he is not going to give it his best. He can kill me."

A radarman supports his family by driving a bulldozer from 7:30 a. m. to 4 p. m.; and then goes on his radar watch from 4:30 p. m. to 1 a. m.

In this article are documented examples of housing where rats chew buttons off the uniforms; of skilled mechanics pleading for heat in their hangars so they can continue vital maintenance work on planes without freezing their fingers; of men surrounded by so much untrained personnel, and so much skimping, they know they can never do their job if this country is attacked.

These are not men of any foreign legion. These are our own, the ones who carry the shield of deterrence against possible Communist aggression. They are underpaid, undertrained, and under-equipped. We take these young men from our farms, our towns, and our cities. We expect them to defend us, but ask them to do the job with, in effect, one hand tied behind their backs.

If they have the duty to do the job—one of the most important in the world today—we have the duty to see that they have the best training and the best equipment so as in turn to have the best chance of returning home.

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE MASS-PRODUCED MIND—ADDRESS BY LOUIS P. LOCHNER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it will be recalled that on January 29 I mentioned on the Senate floor the establishment of the mass communications history center by the Wisconsin State Historical Society—the very first such center in the Nation.

I have been pleased now to receive from Dr. Clifford Lord, the society's president, the text of the address which was delivered by one of America's most distinguished correspondents, Mr. Louis P. Lochner, on the occasion of the formal opening of the center.

Mr. Lochner, it will be recalled, was from 1928 to 1942 chief of the Berlin

and Central European Bureau of the Associated Press.

His news dispatches, during the National Socialist regime in Germany, constituted some of the most remarkable contributions to the understanding of that evil period in history.

Mr. Lochner, now retired, was a graduate of the University of Wisconsin in 1909. He began his journalistic career as an editor of the Wisconsin Alumni Magazine. Thereafter, he became a foreign correspondent, winning a great many honors for his articles, as well as his books.

His comments on January 25 upon the effect of mass communications—newspapers, radio, and television—on the minds of the people constitute very fine food for thought, whether or not one agrees with him completely.

What he has to say, moreover, about the tremendous importance of freedom of the press will, I am sure, strike a resonant chord in the minds and in the hearts of readers. Of all the great bulwarks of freedom, our right to read these conflicting viewpoints in information media is one of the greatest of all pillars of liberty. The commentator plays an indispensable role in this process. May the commentator's basic freedom always be protected.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lochner's frank and helpful address be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE MASS-PRODUCED MIND

(By Louis P. Lochner)

When Clifford Lord and Donald McNeil suggested some weeks ago that I speak to you tonight on the subject of Communications and the Mass Produced Mind, I was instantly reminded of a talk I had back in 1953 with that wise sage of central Europe and staunch friend of the United States, venerable Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of the Federal Republic of Germany.

His greatest concern, he said, was the fact that we were living in an age in which what he called *die Vermassung des Menschen* is progressing so alarmingly that individualism is in danger of being submerged. Now, there is no single word in the English language, as far as I know, that will express *Vermassung* accurately. It is difficult to translate concisely as *Gemueticlichkeit* or *Weltschmerz*.

Ever since that 1953 chat I have been groping for an adequate English equivalent of the German Chancellor's phrase, only to find now that the directors of the Wisconsin State Historical Society have served it to me on a platter, as it were: by *Vermassung des Menschen*, Dr. Adenauer obviously means the tendency of our time in the direction of a mass-produced mind.

We are living in an age of mass production and consumption, of this there can be no doubt. The supermarket is gradually making the modest grocery store and butcher shop a thing of the past. The country doctor or the city general practitioner is disappearing and the patient instead has passed into the hands of a whole mass of specialists. The drugstore has become not only a dispensary of pharmaceutical products but also a sales emporium for toys, paperback books, articles of clothing, sweets, alarm clocks, bathing costumes, and space helmets. The registered pharmacist occupies only a small niche in

his establishment. Filling a prescription no longer is accompanied by the soothing sound of a pestle grinding a healing herb to powder in an old-fashioned mortar, or the gentle thud, thud of a gelatine capsule that is being filled by hand of the apothecary. Almost everything a doctor prescribes nowadays has been mass produced.

Motion picture directors seem proudest if they can advertise that literally thousands of humans and animals will be shown in their gigantic, super-duper mass scenes. Our universities and colleges, in which in my day 50 years ago we knew a large percentage of our fellow students, have virtually become intellectual factories. Only a very limited number of collegians today know each other.

Beautiful radio transmissions of symphonies and operas are rudely interrupted by commercials advertising some mass-produced article that will allegedly make housework a pushbutton affair. Need I continue my illustrations of the supplementation of individual by mass production?

From the mass production of things it is but a step to the mass-produced mind. It is an open secret in the theatrical profession that two New York critics whose names I won't mention can make or unmake a show. Apparently the theatergoing mass no longer thinks individually; it accepts the judgment of two men whose syndicated columns reach millions.

My hobby is music. When attending a premiere of a symphony or an opera or pieces for the piano, a string instrument, or voice, I make it a point to ask friends and acquaintances what they think of the composition. Usually I receive the noncommittal reply, "very interesting." I then know that the listener has ceased to do his own evaluation and is waiting for his favorite critic's review. Surely enough, when next I meet this person who dared not go beyond "very interesting" because he feared he might be out of step with the mass-mind-producing critic, I find he has indeed meanwhile arrived at an opinion; namely, that of the critic whose word is law to him.

There was a time, not so long ago, when one of the finest things about a dinner invitation to a cultured home was the joyful anticipation of soul-refreshing conversation which would already begin at the table under the inspiration of its artistic decor, its delicious, individually prepared food, its masterfully selected liquid concomitants, and one's stimulating table companion, but which would reach its full fruition only later in the salon or parlor or living room, when the conversation became general and divergent views, frankly but politely expressed, added to its spiciness.

Today it is by no means uncommon for the hostess anxiously to watch the clock to make sure that everybody will have finished eating and drinking the mass-produced canned foods and libations in time to follow her to a TV set for viewing a program that in her belief is made to order for her company. She thereby merely exemplifies that the mass-produced mind threatens to dominate our social life quite as much as it does every other phase of human living-together.

Now, one main reason for this growing ascendancy of the mass-produced mind (to which we must adjust ourselves, whether we like it or not) is the fact that the communications mediums have been perfected to a degree that the world is now brought pictorially right into our living room, that every event of importance, even if it transpires in a remote corner of the earth, almost immediately becomes known everywhere, that every major speech delivered by a person of prominence resounds throughout the homes of millions. Gigantic radio and TV networks with international exchange arrangements, world-embracing news associations

with facilities for moving story and illustrative newsphoto simultaneously, and feature services which supply the intellectual product of famed columnists to an international clientele—all these have, in one sense, made one world of this planet of ours and have, indeed, produced a mass curiosity as to what other planets may be like.

It is, I believe, no exaggeration to say that the mass-produced mind, whose existence no one can deny, owes its being chiefly to the phenomenal development of communications and communications mediums.

The mass-produced mind is most quickly brought into being and most easily manipulated in the countries in which only such information is imparted, only such ideological discussion is tolerated, and only such facts or alleged facts may be published as will serve to tighten the grip of the tyrant or ruling clique.

Now, it is thinkable that the colossal dictatorships of our time could so quickly have remolded the thinking processes of populous and culturally advanced nations except for the modern mediums of communications? And why is it that in wartime one of the first targets of an invading enemy force is the communications centers—the radio and TV stations, the news association headquarters, the telephone and telegraph and wireless installations? Why is every effort made to seize these communications centers intact, if not because of their importance in influencing—yes, changing—the existing mass-produced mind?

Had Hitler or Stalin or Peron lived a century earlier, could they possibly have taken such a complete hold so quickly of the peoples whom they set out to bring under their sway, and could they in such an astonishingly short time, as human history goes, have so completely remade the thinking processes of millions of their subjects? Were not the modern mediums of communications their most powerful instruments for the quick subjugation of their satellites?

How docile the mass-produced mind can become in a powerful dictatorship was patently illustrated the other day in connection with President Eisenhower's appeal to Bulganin. Four days elapsed without the Russian people's even being told that the American Chief of State had replied to the Soviet Premier's two letters. The masters of the Kremlin evidently knew that nobody in Russia would complain at this withholding of information.

Only after the Politbureau had been goaded by the worldwide discussion of the exchange of letters into making a grudging public acknowledgment of the receipt of the American reply did the Soviet regime deem it necessary to reveal to its captive people in a distorted and eminently unfair manner, a vague intimation of the contents of the Eisenhower missive. Not a word was said about the President's earnest plea to the Soviets to share in concrete labors of peace, not a syllable about his readiness to go the last mile if necessary to avert international carnage.

The Reporter magazine on October 17 last carried an interesting article, Complacency, Conformity, and a Moskvich in Every Garage, by Hans Rogge, who traveled far and wide in the Soviet Union. "There was among most of the people I talked to an acceptance of the basic assumption on which (Soviet) state and society rest," he wrote. Then, as an example of how uncritical the Russian people have become he gave this illustration: The much-decorated army captain who asked me on the train going to Odessa why our newspapers constantly slandered the Soviet Union had, of course, never read one, but he was absolutely convinced that foreign papers could be obtained at any newsstand. In other words, so conditioned is the mass-produced mind of Russia that this army captain did not even have

the curiosity to find out whether he might freely buy a foreign newspaper.

One day early in his campaign for the domination of the German mind Adolf Hitler's wily minister of propaganda, diminutive Dr. Joseph Goebbels, made an interesting experiment in duping his conationals. The official German news bureau, D. N. B., was ordered to release a Goebbels-inspired story to the effect that two foreign unidentified planes, flying over Berlin at an altitude of 5,000 yards, had dropped leaflets which were so insulting to "der Fuehrer" that they were immediately seized by the police. The news release stated that this was an obvious attempt by some foreign power to sow dissension within Germany and thus to rob the Reich, which at last was growing strong under the leadership of Adolf Hitler, of the fruits of unity.

Publication of the dramatic account of this alleged sneaking flight was made mandatory for all German newspapers. Moreover, the press was instructed to publish the story on the first page with smash headlines. The D. N. B. secret directives added, however—and please keep this in mind for the next few minutes—that it would be preferable for each paper to write the introductory paragraph, or lead, in its own style and as though your editor had seen the planes.

The rather amazing situation developed that, listen as I would among people in every walk of life in the German capital, I found nobody who thought of challenging the story. Already the German mind, as mass-produced by Goebbels, had been so conditioned as to accept the story unquestioningly.

There was one vital mistake which the kleine Doktor made and which he was clever enough not to repeat later: he issued his instruction to the German press to describe the incident as though your editor had seen the planes, in the general service distributed to foreign correspondents and services as well as to German. This order should have gone out as a secret instruction to the German communications media.

Even before noticing this directive, which came at the end of the long press release, we had thought it unusual, to say the least, that the flight of the planes should have taken place during the very hour when the entire foreign press had for the first time been invited to a tea party given by Hitler's leader of the foreign-political section of the Nazi Party, Alfred Rosenberg, in the course of which our host—so the invitation read—was to give us a survey of Nazi foreign policy.

After reading the order to our German colleagues, we naturally went after the story in a big way. The first thing we did in our Associated Press office was to consult an aeronautic expert, who took into account the probable speed and altitude of the alleged planes, as well as the direction and velocity of the wind at the stated time of the flight. His verdict was: the leaflets could not possibly have landed in Berlin, but would have descended in Magdeburg, some 90 miles to the south.

Next we inquired at the Propaganda Ministry exactly where the leaflets had been dropped. We were told in the Wilhelmstrasse and on the Alexanderplatz, in other words, in the two places, of all Berlin, where either the propaganda and foreign office personnel or the police, whose central headquarters was on the Alexanderplatz, could hastily seize them before anybody could pick up a copy!

Our aeronautics expert assured us that it was simply impossible to drop leaflets with such precision.

We asked to be shown a copy. "Its wording is so insulting to our 'fuehrer' that we do not propose to show it to anybody," was the reply.

"But how did the leaflets look?" I persisted. "You might at least give us an inkling of their appearance."

"Well, they were pretty poorly printed by hand, with one of those rubber stamp outfits where you put the letters together yourself."

As though a foreign government would send two planes with amateurish hand-made instead of press-printed leaflets.

I stated some minutes ago that the mass-produced mind is most quickly brought into being and most easily manipulated in dictatorships. Also I asserted that this double feat could be accomplished chiefly because of the phenomenal development of communications. That, however, is not the exclusive reason. There is the added and tremendously important one of withholding from a people every means for checking the accuracy of the information imparted by tyrannical governments.

Only those who have lived within a dictatorship and have experienced what it means to be cut off from all information and news except that which the government spoon-feeds to its subjects can grasp how such a condition soon warps one's judgment. Only they will understand fully why tyrannies make listening to foreign radio stations or TV channels punishable, why they forbid the importation of foreign newspapers which are critical of their regime, and why they go to outrageous lengths to prevent any corrective information from penetrating their country. With these counterweights of truth suppressed, a regime can manipulate the mass-produced mind effortlessly.

That brings us to the vital difference between a mass-produced mind in a dictatorship and in a democracy: granted that the impact of our modern media of communications upon the masses of our people is terrific to the point of endangering individualism; granted further that this impact will increase rather than diminish with the expansion of technological development, as is indicated, for instance, by that latest engineering device known as the phantom plug or hidden commercial which a New York Times writer defines as "a sales message pitched so fast by a projector onto a TV or movie screen that it is not consciously seen by the viewers" yet "subconsciously . . . works on lowering the sales resistance of the moviegoers" and the TV viewers.

Granted all this. Even so there remains the corrective of the inherent right of every American to know—a right which, thank God, he keeps on asserting. There remains the possibility of comparing conflicting claims and weighing them judiciously. There remains the availability of proven facts to demolish untruthful asseverations. Those who manipulate a dictatorship cannot afford to be proven in error; we in a democracy proudly claim our right to be wrong as one of our dearest and most priceless privileges.

In the challenging task of making the mass-produced mind an asset to our national life and of preventing it from becoming a danger rather than a blessing, it is imperative that just as much as is humanly possible should be known and studied that will throw light upon the effect of modern mass communications upon society.

The Wisconsin State Historical Society has done an outstanding job of pioneering by launching its Mass Communications History Center. I extend my heartfelt congratulations.

The skeptic may ask: of what value can the papers and documents possibly be which men and women in communications are invited to contribute? What can they reveal that has not already been told in their news stories and newscasts? What can they add toward our understanding of the impact of mass communications upon the human mind? What light can they throw upon

the phenomenon itself which your directors aptly call the mass-produced mind?

When one speaks, say of the Kaltenborn papers, one must remember that my friend "H. V.," like all of us who were or are on the constant lookout for news and to proper clues for its proper evaluation, in reality produced far, far more than ever reaches the public. Even if an Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, or major network correspondent were to present to this center of yours a complete collection of clippings or transcripts of every story that was printed or went out over the air waves or was mailed in one of the feature services, these items would reflect only a fraction of his productivity and impart only a small percentage of the information, often of historical importance, which came to his knowledge.

Speaking as a news association man and foreign correspondent, I can assure you that our Berlin Associated Press staff of 9 men, 7 of whom were Americans, consciously sent much more to our headquarters in New York, especially in the way of mail stories, than we expected to see published. We wanted to offer our editors variety from which to choose whatever seemed most interesting to our fellow Americans. The desk editor was able to gage that interest; not we living abroad.

Let me explain some of the factors that enter into the situation:

1. A story which seemed decidedly newsworthy at the time we cabled it and which on an ordinary day might even have made the first pages of many metropolitan papers, might happen to reach the foreign editor's desk in the home office at the very moment when the first news was flashed of some major catastrophe, such as a sudden volcanic eruption or a tricky tornado, accompanied by wholesale loss of lives, spread of pestilential diseases, and awesome material destruction. The Berlin story obviously could not compete with such major news. Not only our item, but countless others from other localities in such a situation would go into the wastebasket.

2. Again, news association and network reporters as well as correspondents for individual papers often send in advance of a scheduled or likely event, valuable information known as background material. This under-the-dash material, as it is also known because it is usually separated from the news item proper by a dash, usually deals with the locale of the event, gives a description of the personalities involved, presents historical facts leading up to the anticipated occasion. It is regarded as manna from heaven by the busy news editor or the network commentator who would like to embellish the bare news item somewhat.

But what if the event is suddenly called off? What if the locale is unexpectedly changed or the leading figures do not show up? What if other important news competes with the event and only the most salient facts as embodied in the news dispatch can be used? All the careful preparatory work would seem to have been done in vain.

3. Often a good story fails to reach the home desk and, of course, the reading or listening public because people in public life altogether too often won't stand by what they said and as an afterthought demand that this or that statement be stricken from their interview.

Somewhere among the papers which I had the honor to present to this center there is a revealing text of an utterance concerning the Jewish question which Adolf Hitler made in the course of an interview I had with him. It was never published because Hitler had made it a condition for receiving me, that I would submit the text for his clearance.

The burden of his pontification was that the Jew must be eliminated from the German

scene because, as he put it, "wir koennen als Volk ihn nicht verdauen" ("we cannot as a people digest him"). The Italians, for instance, he said, could assimilate or digest the Jew, ditto the British, but not so the Germans.

I could not but chuckle inwardly at this statement, for Hitler had only a few minutes previously extolled the superman qualities of the Nordic race of which, incidentally, he was a most unrepresentative specimen. It seemed like a tremendous confession of weakness on Hitler's part to admit that a nation made up of 99 percent of alleged supermen could not assimilate or, if you please, coexist with the 1 percent of its population that was non-Aryan.

The Nazi dictator must have noted himself what a fatal admission he had made, for with an angry gesture he crossed the whole passage out as he read my script. Incidentally, when I started him on the Jewish question, white saliva exuded from both sides of his mouth.

It is only a tiny episode as history goes, yet the question still intrigues many historians, "why was Hitler so anti-Semitic?" Here is one answer: an obvious inferiority complex.

4. Very often a member of our craft writes confidential memorandums to his boss, revealing facts and incidents which for some reason or other are not intended for publication. Also, he often communicates characterizations about figures in the public eye which, though truthful, are not exactly fit to print. I am sure carbon copies of many such memorandums will find their way into the Mass Communications History Center.

We in Berlin during the Nazi regime frequently requested unsuspected fellow nationals, such as prominent businessmen, on their return to America to take with them confidential letters to our home office. Their discovery by ardent Hitlerites might well have led to our expulsion.

I feel confident that those who are in the domestic communications service also often fill in their superiors on situations that cannot for the present be exploited newswise. Such memorandums might well be helpful to the historian.

5. Another fact about the communications professional is the enormous correspondence that he carries on with men and women in all walks of life. He exchanges letters with statesmen, scientists, literary men, financial experts, economists, labor leaders, and so forth. Thousands of these letters, as they reach this new center, will no doubt have to be eliminated because they really contain nothing of possible historical significance. But I dare equally to prophesy that the historian will here and there dig out from among the papers permanently filed what to his researcher's heart will seem like nuggets of gold.

May I be so bold as again to cite an example from the papers which I was privileged to deliver? I do it because they are the only ones with which I am acquainted; other collections are probably much more valuable and would yield better illustrations, but my ignorance of them is complete.

When I reached Berlin with the very first American occupation troops in July of 1945, one of Germany's best known lawyers came to see me. He was a former president of the German Bar Association and one of the small number of German attorneys free from Nazi taint whom the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg admitted as defense counsel for the accused Nazi leaders. We had known each other for years and had last seen each other at the 60th birthday party of Fritz Kreisler, the world-famed violinist and composer, who had soon thereafter been compelled to leave Germany and the playing of whose inimitable music was forbidden by the Nazi regime.

This noted barrister was in a soul-searching mood. "How could it happen that this nation of a Goethe and a Schiller, of a

Beethoven and a Richard Strauss could succumb to an Adolf Hitler?" he asked me, and the next moment began such a brilliant analysis that I interrupted him with the suggestion that he really ought to put his thoughts down on paper.

The result was a series of at least half a dozen letters which to me seemed most revealing. He was not the only one to write me. All such letters were kept by me and have been or will yet be added to my modest contributions to this center, for I know that the question, "How could Hitler happen?" is still a very live one with people interested in nazism and its implications.

6. A sixth fact to remember about workers in the communications mediums is that many of them build up confidential relationships with persons in high or influential positions and thus are often told facts which they must keep to themselves until a much later period, either to protect their source or for other cogent reasons. Washington and United Nations correspondents probably lead in this category.

A few days ago I chanced to come across a memorandum drafted on February 21, 1947, when I was a member of the 6-man team which, headed by former President Herbert Hoover, was appointed by President Harry Truman to make a survey of conditions in Germany and Austria. On our way back from Germany, Mr. Hoover called upon Prime Minister Clement Attlee in London to brief him on what the mission had done and what recommendation, based upon our findings, the former President was about to make.

While Mr. Hoover was closeted with Premier Attlee, I was introduced to a man, now an important laborite member of Parliament, who had been engaged in psychological warfare work through World War II. He took me aside and made these points which I now feel at liberty to quote from my memorandum:

"The attempt on Hitler's life on July 20, 1944, was believed by the psychological warfare chiefs to be genuine, and they thought it would open a possibility of ending the war by supporting the revolutionists. Brendan Bracken (the British Information Minister), however, ruled that this was 'a Goebbels propaganda trick' and refused to do anything about it. C—believes the war might have been shortened by 7 months had the allies supported the July 20 people."

"The psychological warfare people next tried to persuade Eisenhower to issue a sort of soldier-to-soldier or officer-to-officer appeal to the German generals. According to C—, Roosevelt messaged Eisenhower to 'keep his hands off politics.'"

"When the Allies approached the Saar Valley, the psychological warfare people urged that the Saar miners be assured their jobs and wages were secure and that they should continue to mine. The suggestion was turned down by Washington on the grounds that under unconditional surrender no promises of any kind must be made to any Germans."

"Eisenhower finally agreed to a project of psychological warfare for urging the German population to keep off the streets as the (Allied) armies proceeded, the thought being that then our forces could advance the more quickly. Unfortunately Churchill came to Paris on the day this policy was approved and, learning of it, insisted that the Germans should be given a dose of their own medicine, as applied by them when they overran France, and the population be induced to clutter the roads."

It goes without saying that I shall turn this memorandum over to Dr. Lord. Whether it has any historical value is up to the professionals in the field to decide.

One more closing thought: paradoxical though it seems, it is an indubitable fact that the very men and women who, with the aid of our modern mediums of communica-

tions are bringing into being a mass-produced mind which often tends to endanger individualism—these very men and women are themselves about the most individualistic creatures God ever made. If you don't believe it, try to preside, as I have, over a meeting of the Overseas Press Club, all of whose members have seen foreign lands and have been in journalistic service both within and outside the United States. It is often claimed that our 1,500 members have at least 1,600 opinions. Personally I believe that is an understatement of the year. If anywhere in the world there is a fraternity of individualists, it is to be found in the communications profession.

PROPOSED PLAN FOR 10-NATION CONTROL OF ANTARCTICA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post contains an interesting dispatch from the Chicago Daily News Service, but one which gives me considerable concern. The article is entitled "British Seek Polar Rule by Group of 10 Nations."

The substance of the article is that Great Britain is prepared to recommend internationalizing of the South Pole land mass under a 10-nation commission, including both the United States and the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, as the author of the Wiley bill for the Byrd Antarctic Commission, I am all for a conference by the interested nations. But I am opposed to any internationalization of Antarctica. I am opposed to it for several reasons.

WE HAVE DONE MOST OF EXPLORATION

(a) In the first place, it is the United States which has made the overwhelming share of sacrifices—commitments of manpower, time, energy, and money for the exploration of the "Unknown Continent."

We, alone, have done more work in Antarctica than all the rest of the world combined.

For us to agree to become simply 1 member of a 10-nation commission, where we could be outvoted 9 to 1, or 7 to 3, or by any other combination, would be to forget the overwhelming amount of American sacrifices in the region.

WHO KNOWS FUTURE VALUE OF ANTARCTICA?

(b) Next, I want to point out that the significance of Antarctica to the United States from a military, economic, political, or weather standpoint can hardly be ascertained at the present time.

No one knows right now how important this vast region of 5 million square miles will be in terms, for example, of man's penetration of outer space, man's future control of the weather, man's hunt for raw materials and minerals.

How can we, therefore, in the present uncertain state of knowledge, take a step which might lead to deeding away territory which might be of infinite importance to us in time to come?

(c) I do not believe that we should waive rights directly, or indirectly, to so much as an inch of Antarctica. That does not mean that we should claim 1 inch of more than is our due.

Many nations have filed their claims in the area. It will take a great amount of international negotiations in order to iron out the conflicting claims.

But I say that I do not want us to act so that future generations rise up and bemoan what might perhaps prove to be our folly in giving up a resource which, one day, may be very precious, indeed.

In 1958, we look back to past decades of American history. We give praise to the men of vision and judgment who bought Louisiana in 1803. We praise those who bought Alaska for the United States and those who acquired other territory. Why should we think of waiving so much as an inch of territory which may, someday, be as valuable to us as are Alaska, Louisiana, California, New Mexico?

To be sure, Antarctica is a long way from us geographically; but it is very close to us in the age of air, in the age of travel in outer space.

TRIBUTE TO OTHER NATIONS' VALOR

I want to make it clear that my comments are not directed against any nation. My comments are not aimed, as such against the British, the Australians, the New Zealanders, the French, the Norwegians, Argentinians, Chileans, or the South Africans; all of whom claim some part of Antarctica.

On the contrary, I am delighted at the cooperation which we have shown to them and which they have shown to us in the International Geophysical Year, and on many other occasions.

Many brave men—Englishmen, Norwegians, and heroes of many other nations—have just about frozen; and, yes, often died in order to unlock the secrets of Antarctica. I pay tribute to all of them. The American people have nothing but admiration for valor; no matter under what flag it is demonstrated.

LET US CONFER BUT NOT LOSE OUR RIGHTS

Of course, we must sit around the conference table and talk over problems like Antarctica with our friends. But talk is one thing, internationalization another.

MY INTEREST IS UNITED STATES FLAG

I am a Senator of the United States, and my interest is the sovereignty and the flag of the United States, and the future of the United States.

I do not want the Soviet Union casting a veto in any 10-nation or 81-nation commission in Antarctica. I do not want the Soviet Union, if it can possibly be avoided, building a submarine base, or a guided-missile base, or anything else of that kind in the unknown continent.

I say that very frankly and openly, because I think the time is long overdue for the United States to wake up to the protection of its own national interests in that region.

I welcome British steps toward talks, as such. My earnest hope is that the conflicting claims may be worked out in a manner agreeable to all.

But past history of the United Nations, and other multilateral organizations, shows that when you are dealing, not with the free world alone, but with the Soviet Union, you are dealing with a very tough bargainer, indeed. And you had better keep your eyes wide open.

I urge that we, of the United States, maintain permanent bases in Antarctica and I urge that we take no step which

might remotely suggest that we are prepared to waive anything which is our lawful due.

Most of all, I urge that the Senate Education and Labor Committee and the House Interior Committee hold hearings at the earliest possible date on the Wiley-Byrd antarctic bill which I have cosponsored.

I ask unanimous consent that the Post article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH SEEK POLAR RULE BY GROUP OF 10 NATIONS

LONDON, February 12.—The British are preparing to propose internationalizing the South Pole land mass under a 10-nation commission.

The United States and the Soviet Union would be included on the commission.

Conflicting claims for great chunks of Antarctica would be solved, it is pointed out, and the area would be open for scientific experiment.

The plan would keep the area free of military installations.

The British recognize themselves, the Australians, the New Zealanders, the French and the Norwegians as major claimants to Antarctica.

Argentina, Chile, and South Africa also claim sovereignty over parts of the area. The first two say that much of the recognized British sector belongs to them. South Africa claims part of the Norwegian sector.

The Americans and the Russians recognize nobody's claims and have gone ahead installing permanent bases.

The United States base on the South Pole laps over into the British, Australian, and New Zealand sectors.

The Russian base is in the sector long claimed by Australia.

The commission would have some tieup with the United Nations, but would not depend upon the world peace organization for its authority.

Throughout the Geophysical Year there has been agreement to keep claims and counter-claims in the background, but with its close, friction over who owns what is bound to recur.

DEFENSE OF SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES BY SENATOR BRIDGES

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, last week our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] delivered a spirited defense of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles here on the Senate floor. The February 11 issue of the Portland Press-Herald contains a fine editorial on Senator BRIDGES speech.

All of the Members of the Senate may not be aware of the fact that the senior Senator from New Hampshire is a native of the State of Maine and a graduate of the University of Maine. His mother still lives in West Pembroke, Maine, which is "way down east." I am delighted to have an opportunity to join the Portland Press-Herald in saluting a distinguished native son of Maine who now represents our neighboring State of New Hampshire in the United States Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Portland Press-Herald may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of February 11, 1958]

SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES DEFENDS SECRETARY DULLES

Senator STYLES BRIDGES had something to say, last week, to the many who attack, even vilify, Secretary of State Dulles. What he had to say is something to be noted by many critics of the Secretary, many of them really ignorant of what he has done, is doing, and trying to do in one of the most difficult eras that any Secretary of State ever faced. It has been quite the fashion to deride Mr. Dulles, to demand that President Eisenhower fire him.

It is perhaps relatively unimportant when private citizens turn thumbs down on him. Senator BRIDGES thinks it vitally important when Members of the Congress do it; and he cautioned his fellow Senators that Mr. Dulles' attackers are only aiding the Russians; that to disparage our Secretary of State is to aid the Communists. And he said that he, for his part, is unwilling "to surrender the selection of our Secretary of State to Bulganin and Khrushchev."

That sounds like good sense, and so not a few Senators, Democrats among them, thought by signifying their approval of Mr. BRIDGES' position.

SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF THE "MAINE"

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, Saturday, February 15, will mark the 60th anniversary of a most significant event in American history. On the night of February 15, 1898, an explosion took place in Habana Harbor which reverberated around the world, and which wrote a new chapter in the history of our Nation; an explosion which caused the death of the pride of our Navy, as well as the death of a great overseas empire. On that night the U. S. S. *Maine* was torn apart by a force of flame and fragments the cause of which is yet a mystery.

There is little need to describe the repercussions of this event. The story is known to all Americans. The sinking of this great battleship was the signal which aroused a youthful Republic against an old empire, and the motto it bred, "Remember the *Maine*" served to lead our Nation to victory.

The loss of the U. S. S. *Maine* was a serious one, for when this great 6,632-ton ship sank she carried with her to the bottom of Habana Harbor 266 American lives. Only 88 of the crew survived. It was a great tragedy, and one which in its day was highly comparable to the events of that fateful day, December 7, 1941.

The battleship *Maine*, although corroded by the elements of time, is immortal. She represents not only a significant chapter in the annals of the United States Navy and in the history of our Nation, but she bears the name of a great State whose past is inextricably tied to all the great moments of our Nation's history since the voyage of the Norsemen, and whose future will continue to follow in the path of this great heritage. As the State of Maine has always been proud to have lent its name to our Nation's most historic battleship,

so the U. S. S. *Maine* was honored to bear the name of a great State.

I request unanimous consent that an article describing the sinking of the *Maine* which appeared in the Portland Sunday Telegram of February 9, 1958, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMEMBER THE "MAINE"?—IT HAPPENED IN HABANA HARBOR 60 YEARS AGO

(By John Fuller)

The gas lights glowed on early that winter's evening of 1898.

A cold wind whined across Casco Bay and snow—just as the weatherman had predicted—was commencing to fall. It was a likely night to remain at home, although there were those in Portland with plans that would take them out into the weather.

There was, for example, a firemen's ball at Red Men's Hall, Deering. The Odd Fellows were meeting in South Portland. And the Rentz-Santley burlesque company expected their usual appreciative audience at the Portland Theater.

Doctors were on the alert this bitter, gloomy night since Maine's younger generation was fevered by a measles epidemic. At the Maine School for the Deaf in Portland there were 10 cases.

In Maine, as elsewhere in the United States, anyone who could read a newspaper knew that relations with Spain were deteriorating over the question of Cuba, where insurgents cried, "Independence or Death."

Their voice was growing ever louder. The date was Tuesday, February 15, the day after St. Valentine's Day.

Far down the Atlantic coast, in the harbor of Habana, Cuba, the evening had arrived in marked contrast to that in Portland. It was sultry, oppressive. In the air was a miasma of waterfront odors of a pungency and texture that only a tropical port could produce.

From the infestation of sailor cafes emanated sounds of laughter and guitar music to drift across the narrow inner harbor. In fact, almost every sound ashore could be heard on the ships.

One of these vessels was the United States Navy's pride, the 6,892-ton battleship *Maine*. Bristling with a main battery of 10-inchers and 6-inchers, she was illuminated this evening like a Christmas tree with the intent of making even myopic Cubans—and Spaniards—aware of her bulldog presence.

President McKinley had dispatched the 3-year-old warship just 3 weeks before to this trouble spot in the Western Hemisphere. He reasoned, as did Consul Gen. Fitzhugh Lee in Habana, that the *Maine* would not only generate respect for American citizens and property in Cuba but might even play a passive mailed dove of peace.

The commander of the *Maine*, Capt. Charles Dwight Sigsbee, was the antithesis of the consul general. Slim, quiet, and correct, he could be counted on to do nothing inflammatory while in this Caribbean powder keg.

He and his mighty command had been recent, popular visitors in Portland Harbor. There he had spelled out the name of his battleship in giant letters above the bridge illuminated with electric lights.

About 9:30 o'clock this Tuesday evening the wind shifted to the northwest, and the *Maine* swung slowly at her anchorage. She did not stop until she had changed heading almost 180° and her bow was pointing toward the Spanish naval station, no more than 600 yards distant.

POSITION SHIFTED

It was the first time the easterly trades had shifted since the *Maine* had tied on to the Government mooring. It was as well the first time the battleship had changed position.

Among those who noticed it was Captain Sigsbee himself. To him, it signified a weather alteration. He observed to his executive officer, Lt. Comdr. Richard Wainwright, that rain would probably follow.

Then he went below to his spacious, comfortable cabin.

A tall, 19-year-old signalman, Gustav Dressler, on watch on the bridge, also made mental note of the wind shift. Next, he became aware of the running lights of a large steamer sweeping into the harbor. When he identified it as the Ward liner *City of Washington*, now gliding under the guns of the fort Casa Blanca, he resolved to go aft and report the arrival to Lt. John Blandon, officer of the deck.

Dressler marveled anew at the crowded anchorage. The two-masted Spanish cruiser *Alfonso XII* was so close that he could almost have thrown a ball onto her decks. The Spanish naval transport *Legaspi* rode at anchor nearly as close.

And winding between the vessels was the ferry from Regla, her passengers noisy, drunk, as usual. Dressler continued aft, vaguely disquieted by the profusion of ships, virtually on top of his own.

Captain Sigsbee had fed his pup dog, Peggie, which was now curled up on her master's settee. Sigsbee himself was commencing a letter to his wife. It was a note of apology for forgetting to mail a letter she had handed him nearly a year ago. He had just discovered it in the pocket of his lounging robe.

TAPS SOUNDED

Then he paused in his writing as he heard the notes of a bugle, singularly beautiful in the oppressive stillness of the night. Taps were being sounded forward.

Dressler had paused on his way to the stern to have a cigarette with his buddies.

In Sigsbee's cabin, the overhead fan whirled and Peggie slept. He soon finished his note and placed it in an envelope.

Then, the lights, without warning, flicked off. The floor quaked beneath his feet and he was deafened by a roaring explosion.

He was hurled from his chair onto the deck. In seconds, seawater was over his hands and legs.

To Dressler, the signalman, it happened as if in a dream. In one moment he had been smoking and talking. In the next, he was sprawled in netting around a 6-pounder, on the gun platform above where he had been standing.

Water was swishing around his ankles. The strange thing: He had seen or heard nothing.

Lieutenant Blandon, the officer of the deck whom Dressler had never reached, heard a dull, sullen roar * * * followed by a sharper explosion.

Somehow he kept his footing on the deck even though shipmates around him had jumped into the harbor in fright or had been blown off the stern like paper dolls.

AWESOME SIGHT

The explosion was an awesome sight as seen from the decks of the *City of Washington*—a fountain of red flame, followed by billowing, black clouds of smoke, then a rain of falling debris that sent the vessel's passengers scurrying below decks.

One large concrete-like block crashed through the promenade deck of the Ward liner and plummeted on down to the saloon below.

As Sigsbee, still shocked, groped his way along a semidarkened, smoke-filled passageway toward the deck he met Pvt. William Anthony, of the Marine Guard. The latter, saluting, advised:

"Sir, the *Maine* has been blown up."

Reading in his library in Habana, Consul Lee saw a great column of fire go up in the air. Even before he leaped to the window he seemed to know it was the death eruptions of his Nation's battleship.

He ran outside and off toward the offices of Spain's Governor General, Ramon Blanco. For a man of his age and corpulence, he went fast.

"I moved forward of the superstructure a few feet," Sigsbee was to report later, "and saw in front of me and high overhead a great black mass, dimly outlined against the western sky. On my left was a long, heavy object lying flat and on my right was another."

"These were the smokestacks of the ship, blown far aft, although I could not identify them at the moment * * * the silence on board was ominous, but the great loss of life was not yet realized."

A few moments later, "fire broke out in the great mass of debris amidships, and illuminated the ship."

Not many officers survived. Wainwright, the executive officer, however, was among the fortunate.

"Flood the forward magazines," Sigsbee ordered his executive officer. He was somewhat stunned at the latter's quick reply that nothing forward remained to be flooded.

It became obvious that the forward magazines, containing some 16 tons of black, as well as the less stable brown powder, had exploded.

Sigsbee's command was fast disintegrating in an inferno of smoke and flame. He ordered those remaining with him on the stern to abandon ship.

Only the captain's gig and one whaleboat were left in the battleship's lifesaving equipment. The lifeboats had been blown to bits in the original blast, or blasts.

RESCUE MADE

However, Wainwright decided personally to take one last look around the doomed *Maine* before he obeyed his captain. In doing so he discovered Dressler, who had been joined by two other sailors in their precarious netting perch, sprayed by flames and hot shrapnel.

By now, however, a launch from the *Alfonso XII* was beside the *Maine*, having braved the pyrotechnics about it. Wainwright helped the three sailors into the Spanish craft.

Lifeboats from the *City of Washington* and a motley assortment of harbor craft—from ferries to fishing smacks—were nosing toward the stricken *Maine* as Sigsbee pushed off from the poop deck. There wasn't much left above water of his battleship.

The captain himself was taken aboard the *City of Washington* where he commenced an historic telegram to Secretary of the Navy John D. Long, in Washington:

"*Maine* blown up in Habana Harbor at 9:40 tonight, and destroyed. Many wounded and doubtless more killed or drowned * * *."

Wednesday, February 16, had arrived. In Portland, people paused in shoveling snow to listen to the newsboys' cry of extra. The headlines of the papers they hawked proclaimed: "Disaster Most Dreadful."

The subhead of the Express explained further, "Mysterious Explosion Destroys Battleship *Maine* in Habana Harbor."

It was indeed a "disaster most dreadful" and every protestation of innocence and offer of amends (including deeding to the United States in perpetuity an Habana cemetery plot) seemed too late for calling off the dogs of war. Through the length and breadth of America they were already baying.

On April 25 Congress formally declared war on Spain.

The *Maine*, like Concord Bridge, like the Alamo, like Bull Run or John Brown's Body, was to be remembered—and immortalized.

ONLY 88 LIVED

Of the *Maine's* complement of 354 officers and men, but 88 survived. In the 3½-month war which ensued only 290 soldiers died in battle. It was, the more cynical declared, a

cheap price to pay for the Pacific and Caribbean empires America won from Spain.

Yet the question persisted: What did blow up the beautiful *Maine*? Congress had declared war because, among other sources of friction, it believed the Spaniards had destroyed the battleship.

In 1911 United States Army engineers finally raised the wreckage from the mud of Habana Harbor. The remains of the shattered warship were so twisted, barnacled and rusted that she still clung to her secret with the tenacity of a widow and her memories.

In ensuing years, however, ordnance experts have come to the conclusion that the *Maine* probably blew herself up. Her brown powder was highly unstable, had destroyed or damaged war vessels of other nations. There was also the likelihood of spontaneous combustion in her paint locker or her coal bunkers, or of a dynamo explosion.

One glaring bit of evidence could not be overlooked—how could the *Maine* in busy, traffic-filled Habana Harbor be mined in the first place without someone aboard some ship noticing?

In 60 years no one—in a deathbed confession for example—has come forward with one shred of proof that the *Maine* was destroyed deliberately.

She was, however, a ship that started a war—and wrote a new chapter in American history.

A new *Maine* was launched in 1902. Her career was uneventful. She was hardly more suited to the scientific demands of the 20th century than her forebear, finally was scrapped well before World War II.

But the memories which persisted from the tragedy of Habana Harbor inspired Congress in 1940 to authorize yet another battleship *Maine*. Officially listed as the BB-69, she was contracted for with the New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn—singularly enough, the birthplace of her predecessor.

Preliminary blueprints were drawn and plans accelerated for her construction as World War II embroiled the United States.

By mid-1943, however, as the battleship was being unmistakably supplanted by the aircraft carrier, the Navy revamped its building program. The contract was canceled for the ship whose keel was yet to be laid.

But somewhere in the vaults of the Brooklyn Navy Yard the blueprinted ghost of a U. S. S. *Maine* that was stillborn remains to haunt a file marked "Dead."

AMERICAN PARTICIPATION IN THE BRUSSELS WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, Members of this body have consistently supported in full American participation in the Brussels World's Fair. All funds for this event requested by the administration during the past year have been promptly approved, and many Senators, including most recently the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], have called attention to the urgent need for putting our best foot forward at this tremendous international exhibition.

For 6 months, before more than 50 million people from all over the world, the United States will in effect be "on trial" at the Brussels Fair. Our achievements, our ideals and our way of life will be judged at least in part by our representation at the fair, and, whether we wish it or not, we will be compared either favorably or unfavorably with the Soviet exhibition now going up immediately adjacent to our own.

It is already apparent that the United States is going to suffer by comparison with the Soviets, that we will be outspent, outmanned and outshone in this

competition for international prestige and good will. There is no point now in detailing once again the contrast between Russia's \$60 million effort and the performance we will present for less than \$15 million; nor in attempting to fix the blame for the delay and inadequacies of our own World's Fair budget. The final budget item of \$2,054,000 still awaits action by the other House before this body can act on it. An amendment to this appropriation which simply requested additional funds—for which no plans have been made or budgets devised—would at this late date be of little value; and to insist that the small budget and space already allocated be revamped in order to include some new project would not be helpful in the long run.

In short, the only way in which the Congress can improve our Brussels Fair showing, beyond approving the budget already requested and allocated, is to provide additional funds for our fair participation specifically earmarked for an additional project that can be completed before the fair is half over and that can add real impact to our presentation.

A NEW PROPOSAL

It is my intention to offer such an amendment when the measure containing this latest supplemental fair appropriation comes to the Senate floor. The subject of the additional exhibit I propose is one so basic to our way of life and so high among our greatest feats that I do not see how we can think of omitting it. I refer to the subject of public health.

It is my understanding that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is capable of fitting an outstanding public health exhibit into our present plans, within the time remaining, for as little as \$600,000. Here is an opportunity to demonstrate to the world what American science and research have accomplished, not in missiles and weapons, but in vaccines and sanitation. Let us demonstrate what we have done in our Nation, and stand ready to do cooperatively all over the world, as the President indicated in his state of the Union message, not in the way of snuffing out lives, but saving them, not maiming the bodies of men, but reclaiming them.

Particularly impressive, in my opinion, would be a visual presentation of our efforts and accomplishments in rehabilitating disabled workers—showing to the rest of the world that their crippled and handicapped, too, can become useful assets, not burdens. Perhaps, as Ed Sullivan has suggested on television and in a letter to me, our top medical men like Jonas Salk and Howard Rusk could actually go to Brussels, to demonstrate what we can do, and what Americans are really like.

No such exhibit—no health exhibit of any kind—is planned today for our underfinanced, overcrowded American pavilion. But the U. S. S. R., according to a recent article in the Soviet journal, *Medical Worker*, will have a tremendous public health exhibit displaying Communist knowledge and activity in this field.

If we act quickly and effectively, we can still show to the world that America

seeks nothing more outside her shores than the eradication in all countries of disease, poverty, and degrading standards of living. I hope that the final fair appropriation measure will come before the Senate before it is too late to act, and that at that time other Members will join with me in this effort to demonstrate to a wondering world that our chief concern is not with wars or material things but the helping of all mankind.

REUTHERIAN ECONOMICS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, Walter Reuther's strange brand of "Reutherian Economics" has been discussed at length before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Mr. Reuther on January 28 presented a prepared statement of 110 pages accompanied by 29 technical tables. Regardless of the number of words, the economics behind them is still faulty. His theories are designed to lead us only in one direction, namely, toward state socialism.

The distinguished columnist, Raymond Moley, in the *Waterbury Republican* of January 22, 1958, analyzes Mr. Reuther's economics. His comments should be of interest to all Members of the Congress. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the body of the *Record* at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

REUTHERIAN ECONOMICS

(By Raymond Moley)

Among Walter Reuther's assorted talents is the capacity to propose absurd economic theories to which he attributes solutions to complicated problems of our society. A few days ago the United Auto Workers' political economist—accent on political—came out with one of his more fantastic schemes. Boldly he proposed a two-level collective bargaining program calling for a profit-sharing plan which would take in consumers and employees as well as the auto companies and a wage hike in the industry amounting to at least 10 cents an hour.

This package, he claims, would not be inflationary and would pump purchasing power into the economy. Here, he would have it appear, is an answer to our "ailing economy," here is something for everybody.

The fact that Mr. Reuther's demands smack of genuine socialism is too clear to require elaboration. Facts which should be set straight involve the trickiness of Reuther's economic thinking and his apparent desire to take over the functions of running the entire automobile industry through control of profits, compensation and prices, as well as to control the Government through determination of just what profits in the industry may be taxed by Congress.

Mr. Reuther proposes that profits before taxes up to 10 percent on investment be handled as they are now. He is saying 10 percent before taxes is a fair return. Yet Federal corporate income tax is 52 percent, which leaves for the industry and its stockholders a 4.8 percent profit, certainly not enough either to provide incentive to assume the risks in such a competitive field or to assure necessary reserves for emergencies the future may hold. Profits over 10 percent would be divided—half to the industry and its stockholders, one-fourth to workers and one-fourth to purchasers of automobiles in the form of a rebate at the end of the year.

Since the 1,300,000 members of Mr. Reuther's union pay far lower taxes compared to the high corporate income tax, revenue loss to the Federal Government would be substantial. The rebates would represent a total loss. Together, these items would cost the Government close to \$300 million in taxes from General Motors alone, taking 1956 figures as a yardstick.

Should Reuther's scheme be applied to all industry, tax loss would mount into the billions. In his letter to local unions Mr. Reuther mentioned the demands on our economy imposed by our position in the world. But how would this tax loss be made up? Here Mr. Reuther's economic day-dream disintegrates. His increased purchasing power would be nullified by higher taxes on personal incomes. And perhaps corporate taxes would go up, undercutting even further the possibility for reserves for plant expansion and future exigencies.

Again, Mr. Reuther has revealed himself as a remarkably ambitious man, for he would take it upon himself to control a mighty industry and through manipulations remove from the field of corporate taxation an enormous amount of money.

This plan is further proof of what John L. Lewis recently said, "Well, Reuther is an earnest Marxist."

THE POST OFFICE MODERNIZATION PROGRAM, UNEMPLOYMENT, AND TVA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am interested to learn that Postmaster General Summerfield has proposed a gigantic post-office-modernization program—on a lease-purchase basis, of course—as his partial answer to growing unemployment.

The President says that if things are not better next month he will have a program, too.

The reason for these statements, of course, is the latest unemployment figures—1.1 million rise in January, to a present figure of 4.5 million.

I have a suggestion for the President and the administration, as they look around for things to do. My proposal concerns the Tennessee Valley. Over in the House of Representatives is a bill, passed by the Senate last year, which would provide a method for the TVA to finance its own needed expansions.

The President ought to get behind that bill, and help line up some Republican support for it. If it passes, new steam plants will be built in the valley. They will provide jobs now—and they will be a continuing stimulus to the economy of an entire region of the country. The things that go into these plants will be bought all over the country.

And it will not cost the Federal Government 1 cent—nothing will be added to the national debt—for all we ask for is the opportunity to finance this needed construction ourselves.

The President says he is for this program. He mentions it year after year in his budget messages to Congress. His Budget Bureau, however, has yet to be convinced that he is really for a workable program; they consistently gum it up with unworkable financial provisions.

We managed to provide for the program in the Senate in a workable way over the opposition of the Budget Bureau. That was last year. This is a new year—with new unemployment harass-

ing the Nation—and a new opportunity for President Eisenhower to deliver a few votes to go along with his good wishes to the Tennessee Valley region.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, moral indignation has apparently become too expensive a virtue for the Republican Party.

Day before yesterday we read in the papers that Chairman Alcorn, of the Republican National Committee, would not permit the lily-white hands of his committee to be soiled by touching the \$100,000 raised at the Houston oil and gas dinner for JOE MARTIN. At the same time we learned that Chairman Alcorn's scruples in the matter were fully endorsed by President Eisenhower.

Those Republican moral scruples lasted about 48 hours. This morning we learn that the chairman of the Republican House campaign committee will be glad to have the money. This morning we learn that the chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee says that he will be glad to have the money.

We have not heard today from Jack Porter, the Republican national committeeman from Texas, who now has the money. Doubtless he will be happy now. The money will be going precisely where he intended it to go in the first place.

That money, the Republican national committeeman suggested, in his letter, was needed as a stimulus to help the Republican leader in the House to help persuade votes from Congressmen whose constituents think the gas bill will hurt their interests.

All the bill does is to remove natural gas from price regulation by the Federal Power Commission. All the burden it places on the consumer is a billion-dollar addition to his gas bill every year.

One can understand the anxiety of the natural-gas interests to get this bill passed. If it passes the Congress and is signed by the President, the stroke of his pen will add \$12 billion to the value of gas reserves in the United States. In that one stroke of the pen a fairly small segment of Americans will be made \$12 billion richer. No wonder there is so much effort to get the gas bill passed.

The \$100,000 kitty is now marked money. Voters are going to be mighty curious as to where the money came from and what was done to get it. I am afraid that the sheep will be counted along with the goats.

PHONY PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the announcement by the White House and the Postmaster General of a \$2 billion public-works program is a product of the political mind at work.

I doubt if there is a more expert political mind around than that of the present Postmaster General. This so-called public-works program is one of his finer efforts. It has the outward appearance of a forthright administration step to combat the recession; but internally,

it is loaded with booby traps. In short, it is about as useless as an antirecession weapon as one of Mr. Summerfield's canceled postage stamps.

This mirage of a public-works program is divided into two parts. Part 1 commits the Government to spend the princely sum of \$175 million a year to modernize the Post Office Department.

Even \$175 million pumped into the economy now might be somewhat beneficial. But Mr. Summerfield and the White House intend to finance this \$175 million by taking it out of the pockets of the American public in higher first-class postage.

Giving this modernization program an antirecession coloration is simply a crude effort to blackmail Congress into raising postal rates on first-class mail.

The second part of Mr. Summerfield's dead letter mentions \$1½ billion for new or remodeled post office buildings. This, in terms of money, appears to be more like a genuine effort to come to grips with the recession. But it, too, will blow up in our hands if we look under the surface.

In the first place, it sounds like a new program. But Mr. Summerfield admits it has been going on for the past 4 years.

Secondly, it would obtain new buildings through the least advantageous and most expensive method for the Government—by leasing.

The program is supposed to cover a period of 3 to 5 years, and would cost from \$400 million to \$667 million a year. This is grossly inadequate to fight the recession. Considering the lead time necessary in such a program, it would be many months before the expenditure of even these piddling sums would be felt.

As I suggested on the Senate floor last week, there are many realistic ways to bring back prosperity, including income tax cuts and a genuine public-works program. But the Summerfield-White House method is simply political trickery.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

REINVESTMENT BY AIR CARRIERS OF PROCEEDS FROM SALE OF CERTAIN OPERATING EQUIPMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce that on Monday, February 17, the leadership expects to move the consideration of Calendar No. 1178, H. R. 5822, to amend section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, with respect to the investment by air carriers of the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment.

It is requested that the attachés notify Senators on both sides of the aisle of this proposal.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR MODERNIZATION OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to an announcement by the President requesting Congress to approve a modernization program for the entire postal service of the United States.

I am informed the program will involve rehabilitating, enlarging, or replacing 2,500 Government-owned post offices, and replacing or remodeling 12,000 leased postal buildings and providing modern mail handling equipment for all postal facilities in the United States.

In my judgment, this affords Congress an opportunity to provide a program which many Members have long desired. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] will propose an amendment to the postal rate bill establishing a fund for this modernization program. Each Member of this body will have an opportunity to vote favorably for a program which will, in my judgment, have advantages for every community in our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed, following my statement, the text of the President's statement, which was published in full in the New York Times of Wednesday, February 12, as well as the statement of the Postmaster General, Arthur E. Summerfield, outlining the administration's program for modernization of the postal service which he made yesterday, February 12, before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times
of February 12, 1958]

STATEMENT ON POST OFFICE

WASHINGTON, February 11.—Following is the text of a White House statement today on post office modernization:

"The President today directed Postmaster General Summerfield to present promptly to the Congress a \$2 billion program to modernize the obsolete physical plant of the Post Office Department over the next 3 to 5 years. The program will involve rehabilitating, enlarging, or replacing 2,500 Government-owned post-office buildings, replacing or remodeling 12,000 leased buildings, and providing modern mail-handling equipment for all postal facilities.

"Under the new program, developed by the Postmaster General, the funds from private investors for construction of new post offices to be occupied under lease would approximate \$1,500 million.

"The capital investment to be made by the Government is estimated at \$175 million a year for the period of the program, and would be for mail-handling devices and other equipment for these new leased buildings, and for the costs of rehabilitating and expanding some of the federally owned post offices. The total postal modernization program would therefore involve more than \$2 billion, and would affect every section of the country.

"The Government's portion of these expenditures would be financed by revenues from increased postage rates proposed by the administration and now before the Congress. The budget message has proposed a 5-cent letter rate on out-of-town letters, a 4-cent rate on local letters, and increases in other classes of mail."

POSTAGE TO PAY FOR PLAN

"The plan contemplates that the postage above 4 cents on first-class mail—namely, the 1 cent on out-of-town letters, which will amount to \$175 million a year—will be used to pay the modernization costs. The remaining increases would provide about \$500 million a year to reduce the postal deficit, estimated at \$850 million annually, including pending wage increases for postal employees proposed in the budget. When the program is completed, the added revenues, the improved and more efficient operations which can then be expected, should permit further reduction in the remaining deficit.

"During the past 4 years the Post Office Department has gained valuable experience from its leasing program whereby about 2,000 new postal buildings have been built to its specifications by private investors and leased to the Department. These postal buildings pay local taxes, are sound investments for their owners, eliminate the need for Government capital, and are economical in that they are more efficient for modern mail-handling methods. The new buildings to date have been leased at less cost per foot than older, unsatisfactory space."

RESEARCH ON HANDLING

"During this same period of time the Post Office Department has had a research and engineering program underway whereby modern, mechanical, and electronic mail-handling equipment has been developed to the stage it can now be introduced in new postal facilities. This equipment will speed mail deliveries and help to reduce postal costs.

"Necessary appropriations will be requested for the fiscal years 1958 and 1959 to start immediately the postal facilities modernization program as soon as postal-rate increases have been enacted.

"Unless prompt steps are taken to build and equip the thousands of new post offices needed throughout the country and remodel and refurbish many others, postal service will deteriorate.

"This must not happen.

"The President urges the Congress to approve the plans to modernize the postal establishment as they will be presented by the Postmaster General."

STATEMENT OF POSTMASTER GENERAL ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD OUTLINING THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRAM FOR MODERNIZATION OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. Chairman and the members of this committee, at your invitation I have returned to your committee today for further discussion of the amendment to H. R. 5836, which would establish a 5-cent rate on each ounce of nonlocal letter mail, as proposed by the administration in the 1959 Federal budget.

The time of my appearance is especially timely. Yesterday the President announced that he had directed me to present to the Congress a program for modernization of the postal plant, including the replacement, or rehabilitation and expansion, of many of its buildings, and the procurement of newly developed modern mail-handling equipment.

In many respects, the proposal that I am here to present corresponds with the one outlined by a member of this committee, Senator CARLSON, on the floor of the Senate a few days ago. It contemplates the expenditure of approximately \$2 billion over a period of 3 to 5 years to provide improvements in the postal facilities in every section of the country.

This plan has the dual benefit at this time of not only providing for the needs of the postal service, but of giving the economy a timely stimulus. Fortunately, the progress of our research and development programs of the last 4 years has brought us

to the point of technological knowledge where we can promptly and effectively proceed with the modernization of our mail-handling methods. We are prepared to begin to introduce entirely new mechanical and electronic devices to handle mail.

A large part of the cost of this program will be financed by private investors. Our leasing activities of the last 4 years have provided 2,000 new post offices planned and built under our specifications. We now propose to rehabilitate, enlarge, or replace 2,500 Government-owned post-office buildings, replace or remodel 12,000 leased buildings, and provide modern mail-handling equipment for all postal facilities.

The Government's expenditures will be those necessary to equip these buildings with modern machines and devices, and to rehabilitate and enlarge, as well as equip, some of the federally owned post offices.

The Government's share of this cost will be planned for expenditures at the rate of \$175 million a year. It is proposed that this will be financed by the extra cent above the 4 cents that we are asking the Congress to add to each ounce of nonlocal mail, which will likewise amount to approximately \$175 million a year.

I would like to urge upon this committee the fact that these new facilities and the improved service that will result are necessary to make meaningful to the public the increases in postage that we need to reduce the fantastically large postal deficits.

I would like to review again our financial predicament.

As you will recall, in my last appearance before your committee on January 24, 1958, I outlined our current fiscal situation and pointed out that the aggregate of our postal deficit since 1945 to the end of this fiscal year will amount to \$6 billion.

For fiscal year 1959, we anticipate a minimum operating deficit of \$700 million, exclusive of other possible increases such as contemplated in the various pay bills now before the Congress.

The facts were presented by me which show beyond the question of a doubt that the 5-cent letter rate is equitable, necessary, and in the public interest. These facts included:

(1) Letter mail-cost coverage is now far below the historic average.

(2) Letter mail no longer pays a fair share of total costs of operating the Post Office Department.

(3) Letter mail is the only service that has made no contribution whatsoever, in terms of rate adjustments in the last 25 years to help defray operating cost increases.

(4) Considering the decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar, a letter taking a 3-cent stamp in 1932 would cost 6 cents today.

(5) The Senate action in 1951 in voting a 4-cent rate underscored the reasonableness of the 5-cent letter rate today.

(6) Thirty-four postal systems in foreign countries charge approximately 5 cents for letter mail, even though their labor costs average one-third to one-half of our own postal employees.

(7) Out-of-town letters cost more to handle.

(8) A 5-cent letter rate conforms with policy provisions of H. R. 5836.

(9) The proposed increases in letter rates are still less than recent increases in the telegraph and telephone industries.

Senator FRANK CARLSON's speech on the floor of the Senate on Friday, January 21, 1958, served to point up the serious dilemma that your postal service is now facing. On the one hand, we have huge mounting deficits with an urgent need for rate adjustments to help defray operating cost increases and remove the burden from the general taxpayer of financing these huge growing deficits. On the other hand, we have the serious problem of obsolescence of our out-

dated postal facilities all over the United States.

Federal public works funds have not been appropriated for new United States post office buildings since 1938. During this period of 20 years our national population has increased from 130 million to 170 million—a gain of 31 percent—and the mail volume handled in our post offices has increased from 26 billion to 61 billion pieces—a gain of 135 percent.

Marked changes have taken place in the transportation pattern of common carriers during this 20-year period. For instance, in 1938 there were approximately 6,600 trains carrying mails and today there are about 2,400 mail-carrying passenger trains—a reduction of 63 percent. This means that we must relocate many post offices once built for railroad service but now served by other transportation means. It means that we need a different type of structure—one with land areas required for driveways, and with platform space and docks for truck dispatches and deliveries.

Every city in the Nation has experienced a large-scale movement to the suburbs. There have been over 16 million new non-farm residential units built, each a new stop for the mailman.

The physical plant of the Department has not kept pace with the Nation's growth. More than half of the post office space is concentrated in 3,300 Federal buildings, all located in key gateway cities. These buildings, built in the late thirties or earlier, some over 50 years old, are mostly monumental in character and completely unsuited for today's mail-handling problems. They are multistory with narrow bays, poor lighting, inadequate trucking facilities, and cannot be easily remodeled for mechanization.

During this period of rising costs basic postal rates have remained at the 1932 level and the Post Office Department has operated at ever-increasing huge deficits. The Department has had to depend upon small amounts in its annual appropriations to attack the huge problem of an obsolete plant, instead of through a long-range building program.

The Department has been making progress in improved service by encouraging private enterprise to build some buildings for lease to the Department. This program, as far as it has gone, has proved successful, economical, and highly desirable. To date, however, we have been unable to replace our obsolete large Federal buildings, or provide modern equipment, because of inadequate funds.

Our research and development program has now produced a breakthrough in new concepts of mechanized mail handling. With the first results of this program now available, the Department is now in a position to enter into a planned capital improvement program which will combine modern, one-story, functional post offices, and the newest and most efficient mail-handling equipment with better working conditions. This program, when completed, will substantially reduce our costs to counteract the ever-increasing volume of mail.

While the Congress at this time is considering giving the Department the help it needs to overcome its fiscal plight, it is important for it also to provide the Post Office Department with the means to modernize its obsolete post offices. The increase in the first-class rate on out-of-town mail to 5 cents per ounce will go far to accomplish this objective.

A substantial part of the Federal buildings and also the privately owned buildings which are leased to the Post Office Department are badly in need of modernization or replacement. To modernize or replace these several thousand buildings will cost about \$1.5 billion and this entire invest-

ment would be financed by private capital. The only Government funds necessary would be for the purchase of equipment to be installed in these new or modernized facilities and for rehabilitation and enlargement of some Government-owned buildings. This program, already underway on a very small scale, should be rapidly accelerated with the objective of completion within 3 to 5 years.

To summarize, this program would offer the following advantages:

(1) It would give us a modernized postal service that will take care of the present volume, as well as the anticipated 75 billion pieces of mail by 1970.

(2) It will make possible an important reduction in the costs of handling the increased volume of mail through modernization and the elimination of obsolete equipment.

(3) The poor working conditions existing in most offices will be immeasurably improved for our more than 500,000 dedicated employees.

(4) The morale improvement will be reflected in greatly improved service.

(5) The major portion of the capital expenditure necessary for the program will be provided by private capital rather than a direct appropriation by the Congress and a further demand upon the Treasury of the United States.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, our postal service affects every family in the United States and it is absolutely necessary that this greatest system of communication on earth be maintained in keeping pace with the growth of our country.

Today the postal service of our country is truly at the crossroads.

One road leads to fiscal responsibility and better mail service.

The other leads to still heavier tax burdens on the general public, increased postal subsidies to the large mail users, and unavoidable deterioration of mail service.

The Post Office cannot stand still.

The choice, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, is yours.

PROPOSED CURTAILMENT OF THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, by now I am sure that all of our colleagues in this Chamber have been alerted by the patriots of their respective States to the latest Pentagon plan to curtail our Nation's militia.

Our National Guard, historically the first and last line of America's defense, faces another cut to keep the Regular Army within its 1959 budget.

Last spring, 35,000 volunteers were lopped from the guard rolls to pare them to a mere 400,000 citizen soldiers. Now come reports of another 40,000 slash.

This comes as grave news to a Nation already disturbed about other phases of its survival—at a time when our original satellite failure has betrayed a vacillating loyalty on the part of some of our allies abroad, and at a time when many of us are not too sure that we will win a future war by pushbuttons alone.

In my own State of Maryland, the Army's proposal would strip our historic militia by 2,000 men. Indeed, it threatens the very existence of our beloved 29th Infantry Division of World War II fame.

I am sure that this kind of news shocks not only the Members of this Chamber, but all good Americans every-

where, for our history books have bred in all of us a deep respect for the heroic patriots who have always been there—ready, willing and able—to shoulder arms in our Nation's defense.

Our militia tradition predates the republican democracy it made possible. Our citizen soldiers stood at Bunker Hill before there was an American Army; our Dandy Fifth Regiment routed the tyrant at Cowpens before there was a United States.

The 175th Infantry, once the Dandy Fifth and now part of our 29th Division, has fought with glory and distinction in every war our Nation has waged.

Our 115th Infantry Regiment—in fact, all of our Maryland units, which I mention specifically because I am so well acquainted with them—are responsible for some of the most inspiring chapters of our Nation's history—chapters written in sweat and blood.

Similar contributions have been made by the guard units of other States, too, of course, and the annals of heroism are filled with their proud achievements.

From generation to generation, our militia has handed down the great traditions of a people willing to face any sacrifice to keep our Nation free—free not only from an alien foe, but free also from internal disorder or dictatorship.

Currently, of course, we fear no possibility of a dictator. There are no Hitlers or Perons rising at this time who might convert our Pentagon into a citadel of oppression.

But when we look to certain other lands and see military rulers corrupting governments fashioned in our image, when we see the wretched plight of whole peoples ruled by bayonet in alleged democracies, then we must all realize that but for certain safeguards, it could happen here.

That is not a new thought. Those wise and able men who established our Government feared the military tyrant. And they charged us—the Members of the Congress—to see that no man on horseback ever subjugates our free land.

Mr. President, I cite only as a reminder article 15, section 8, of our sacred Constitution. Here our forebears charged the Congress specifically with the duty "to provide for calling forth the militia." And in article 16, the duty is imposed on us "to provide for organizing, arming and disciplining the militia."

I fail, Mr. President, to see how we can relegate these solemn duties to the Pentagon.

It has always been a matter of wondrous amazement to me to watch history unfold and realize how our Founding Fathers foresaw and provided safeguards for almost every emergency our Nation has faced in almost 200 years.

In this matter, too, they showed the same rare wisdom. They considered the militia of such importance to a free people they took even further steps to keep our citizens armed.

Mr. President, I now quote from article 11 of history's most magnificent afterthought—our hallowed Bill of Rights. It says:

A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of

a people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

Those are not my words, Mr. President, I wish they were. They were the words of our forebears, protecting us from shortsighted expediences.

They considered this provision so vital, so inherent to our liberty, that they told why they did it—to defend the security of a free state. It is the only measure in the entire Constitution, Mr. President, which bears an explanation of why it is there.

So I take the floor, today, to remind the Congress, and the Pentagon, that our Constitution says the right of the people to bear arms shall not be infringed.

It shall not be infringed by manpower cuts that reduce it to an impotent corporal's guard.

Nor shall it be infringed by appropriation cuts that reduce the proportions of our Minutemen too far below those of our professional soldiery.

Mr. President, I remind the Congress that with a "well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state," we must justify the trust reposed in us by the Founders and see that it is just that—well regulated—with enough officers and men and material to insure that security.

To do otherwise is to betray our free heritage—to pave the way for a future and more successful Aaron Burr.

I am sure you will recall, Mr. President, that our initial military draft of 1941 fed most of its manpower levies directly into our mobilized guard units. The Regular Army was not prepared to handle them any other way.

True, the guard was undertrained, undermanned, understaffed. But the guard—along with the Army—was our salvation.

As a peaceful nation without aims of conquest, this Nation has until our current crisis always depended on a small standing army, backed up by its militia.

Mr. President, I close with a thought from the Baltimore Sun on this grave situation. In an editorial which deplores, as many of us do, this hamstringing of our citizen soldiers, the Sun remarks:

It is questionable whether, in a country where many men try to get out of military duty, those who want to serve should be discouraged or denied this opportunity.

I am sure the American answer is "No."

WITHDRAWALS OF LANDS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5538) to provide that withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORRISON in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5538) to provide that withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

At page 2, strike out all after line 19 down to and including line 4 on page 3, and insert the following:

"(4) nothing in sections 1, 2, or 3 of this act shall be deemed to be applicable either to those reservations or withdrawals which expired due to the ending of the unlimited national emergency of May 27, 1941, and which subsequent to such expiration have been and are now used by the military departments with the concurrence of the Department of the Interior, or to the withdrawal of public domain lands of the Marine Corps Training Center, Twentynine Palms, California, and the naval gunnery ranges in the State of Nevada designated as Basic Black Rock and Basic Sawwave Mountain."

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ALAN BIBLE,
FRANK CHURCH,
GEORGE W. MALONE,
GORDON ALLOTT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER S. BARING,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

ACCELERATION OF THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in 1956, the Congress enacted a far-reaching highway-construction program. Of particular significance in the Act of 1956 was the specific recognition of the importance of, and Federal responsibility for, the early completion of a national system of interstate and defense highways. The Act of 1956 contained this specific declaration:

It is hereby declared to be essential to the national interest to provide for the early completion of the "National System of Interstate Highways," as authorized and designated in accordance with section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838). It is the intent of the Congress that the Interstate System be completed as nearly as practicable over a 13-year period and that the entire System in all the States be brought to simultaneous completion.

Under this act, the Federal Government undertook to pay 90 percent of the cost of this segment of our highway system. The act contained authoriza-

tions for Federal expenditures for the years 1957 through 1969, inclusive, totaling \$25 billion. This amount, added to contributions to be made by the States, was estimated to be sufficient to provide for completing the then designated Interstate Highway System within the 13-year period, with construction standards adequate to accommodate types and volumes of traffic forecast for the year 1975.

In making authorizations for a 13-year period, the Congress departed from its prior practice of authorizing highway expenditures for only two years at a time. This action was taken in order to assure the States of the Federal Government's determination to provide adequate funds to complete the system within a definite period of time. This multiple-year authorization also provided needed assurance to the construction equipment, cement, asphalt and aggregate industries, highway contractors, and others associated with highway building, so that they might safely make their plans and might program their activities in such ways as to permit timely completion of this gigantic construction program. It provided assurance, too, to the 48 States.

Under the act of 1956, funds authorized for the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959, totaling \$4,875,000,000, as the Federal contribution for the Interstate System for those years, have been apportioned to the States, and are available for obligation by the States, for engineering, the purchase of rights-of-way, and the award of construction contracts. The several States are now proceeding with their plans involving the expenditure of these sums.

Quite frankly, the progress made in getting actual construction under way is not as rapid as I should like to see it. We must recognize that the problems involved in reaching the construction stage are formidable. Though somewhat tardy, several States are only now in a position to proceed with the actual award of construction contracts involving substantial sums of money.

I call to the attention of the Senate that this very necessary program, now in its early stages, stands in danger. Unless appropriate action is taken by the administration and the Congress, the program will have to be so curtailed as to make it impossible to meet the objectives set forth in the act and to make meaningless the declaration of policy which I have quoted.

If the rate of actual apportionment, as now estimated and recommended by the administration's budget, remains unchanged, construction of the 41,000-mile Interstate System will be stretched out to approximately 24 years.

New estimates submitted by the Secretary of Commerce indicate that the cost of the originally designated 40,000-mile Interstate System will be \$37.5 billion, an increase of about 37 percent, or \$10 billion, over the estimates submitted in 1955. Assuming that the most recent estimates submitted by the Secretary of Commerce are accurate, unless positive action is taken, actual construction of the highway system which the Congress declared should be built by 1969, will

not be finished until 1980, or later. In such event, this grand system of highways will be obsolete even before it is finished.

The President of the United States, in his message to Congress on February 2, 1955, proposed that the Interstate System be built in 10 years, at an estimated average annual outlay of Federal funds in the amount of \$2.5 billion. Specifically, the recommended construction schedule accompanying the President's message provided for the expenditure of \$2.9 billion in the fiscal year 1960. This compares with \$1.6 billion available for obligation under present recommendations.

In his message of 1955, the President pointed out that while one in every seven Americans makes his livelihood and support for his family out of our highway system, the existing network is, in large part, inadequate for the Nation's growing needs.

The economic benefits flowing from an adequate highway network are in themselves ample justification for maintaining the construction schedules set forth in the Highway Act. The need for doing so is even more urgent in view of the current state of our economy. The Labor Department announced this week that in January, 4.5 million persons were actively seeking jobs which were not available. This represented an increase of more than 1 million over the unemployment figure for December, and is 41 percent larger than the figure for January of last year. Everyone predicts that unemployment will be even higher this month.

Some segments of our economy, notably the farmers, have been in a depressed state for several years. Until comparatively recently, other segments of the economy have experienced reasonable levels of activity which, from the standpoint of overall statistics, have tended to obscure the soft spots. One of the more serious aspects of the current recession, however, is that most major segments of the economy are on the downturn simultaneously. Plant expansion has been sharply curtailed; business inventories are being reduced; consumer purchasing shows increased signs of weakness; the home-building industry still suffers from nonavailability of mortgage funds; and the farm economy shows no signs whatsoever of improvement.

I should like to make it clear that I do not consider that we are in a depression, although I admit it might be hard to convince the 4½ million unemployed and other millions who are only partially employed that such is not the case. It is my view that governmental action is necessary to avoid a much more serious situation than that we now face.

It is encouraging that President Eisenhower has recognized the Nation's present economic plight. That is a prerequisite to adequate action. The President did not propose adequate action, however.

One of the most effective means of stimulating our economy is by accelerating a sound public-works program. There is no better place to start than

with the highway program. As a result of the policy declarations in the 1956 act, the highway-construction industry is prepared for a construction program at a higher level than that now in effect. Preliminary planning has been accomplished, and detailed planning for additional projects could be completed in a very short time if availability of funds is assured. The administrative machinery for the program is already in existence and is functioning.

Section 209 of the act contains a policy declaration that it is the intent of the Congress that if total receipts in the Highway Trust Fund are insufficient to meet necessary expenditures, the Congress shall enact such legislation as may be necessary. It is obvious that the time for such action has now arrived. We simply cannot permit the program for construction of an interstate system of highways to be slowed down and stretched out, as it inevitably will be unless action is taken.

Thus far, the only administration proposal affecting the highway trust fund is a recommendation that approximately \$68 million be diverted annually from the fund and be used for purposes other than those of the Federal-aid highway program. I vigorously oppose these proposals to raid the fund. It is abundantly clear that, instead of talking about diverting funds now earmarked for the highway program, we must take necessary action to increase available funds. As a very minimum, we must take action to place in the highway trust fund sufficient funds to permit the apportionment of the full amounts authorized for the interstate system.

Our highway program is aptly described as one for which the users of the highways pay. I have always had serious reservations about earmarking funds in the General Treasury. Such action generally tends toward inflexibility in Government fiscal operations.

Furthermore, it is obvious that good highways benefit everyone, not just those who travel on them. Every business activity in an area served by a new highway benefits from it. I have no hesitation whatsoever in recommending that general revenues be appropriated to the trust fund as required. However that may be, if the Congress decides that only highway-user taxes should be spent for highway construction, I believe the receipts from such taxes will be fully adequate to meet the needs.

In its report on the highway bill in 1956, the Senate Finance Committee estimated that the receipts from the highway-user taxes which, in the aggregate, through 1972 would total \$55,460,000,000. In setting up the highway trust fund, however, not all of these taxes were appropriated to the fund. Only the highway-user taxes which, in the aggregate, were estimated to yield about \$38 billion during this period were earmarked for the fund. If the remainder of these excise taxes paid by highway users were likewise earmarked for the trust fund, the receipts would be adequate to permit apportionment of the full amounts authorized in the act and, in addition, would be sufficient to permit increasing

those authorizations sufficiently to enable them to take care of the increased cost of the interstate system, as well as the needed increases in authorizations for our primary, secondary, and urban Federal-aid systems.

In 1955, President Eisenhower recommended construction of the Interstate Highway System over a 10-year period. He recommended the program as being necessary from the standpoint of national defense, highway safety, and economic progress.

After lengthy and careful consideration, the Congress concurred in the view regarding the necessity for a vigorous highway improvement program, not only with respect to the Interstate and Defense Highways, but also with respect to the primary, secondary, and urban highway systems. The conditions and facts upon which the President and the Congress reached these conclusions in 1956 are still present, and today they are even more pressing.

For instance, more than 37,000 people were killed in highway accidents last year. More than 1 million others were maimed and crippled. The measurable economic losses from highway wrecks exceeded \$4 billion.

Moreover, it is estimated that the additional cost to highway traffic from inadequate highways amounts to approximately 1 cent a mile, which, when measured against the current volume of traffic, amounts to an economic drain of approximately \$5 billion a year on our economy.

These facts are arresting. They dramatically illustrate the severe economic losses which we suffer from inadequate highways. The situation promises to grow progressively worse unless we pursue a vigorous highway-improvement program.

In addition to these facts, which led a Democratic Congress and a Republican President to agree upon a vigorous highway program in 1956, and which today are present and even more pressing, we have the urgent need to stimulate our national economy.

In the face of these impelling conditions and facts, we have a proposed 24-year stretchout of a 13-year program upon which agreement was reached only 2 years ago. This we must not permit. The national interest requires acceleration of its highway program rather a stretchout.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL FOR IMPROVEMENT OF POST OFFICE FACILITIES—A SHAM PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the President of the United States made a statement yesterday that purported to be offering the American people a public-works program of some \$2 billion. It is the characteristic type of sham the President of the United States has been presenting to the people of the United States. In my judgment, it is not a true public-works program at all. It represents another shakedown by the bankers. It represents another example of favoritism for big business in this country. It represents another fraud upon the taxpayers of the country.

We ought to have the type of program in support of which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has just raised his voice in the Senate, a public-roads program that would do something toward bringing to an end highway murder of some 36,000 or 37,000 Americans a year. Experts point out that there is little we can do about the large number of fatalities on the highways until the roads engineering can accommodate the number of automobiles on the highways. Our present roads cannot take such a large amount of traffic.

What does the President propose to do about that? He says not a word with regard to getting the road schedule back on time. He proposes once again, as he did earlier in this administration, another handout to the bankers of this country.

This matter of lease-purchase has been before the Senate of the United States before. I shall insert in the RECORD a part of the debate we had when the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate, pointed out to this country how much more the President's giveaway program to the bankers would cost the taxpayers, and how much less they would be getting than what they would be paying.

It is no understatement to say it amounts to taking away from the taxpayers at least one-third of the cost of construction, in addition to what the Government could build the post offices for, if it built them itself. I am in favor of building post offices, but I am for the Government building them, without a third handout to the bankers and the construction people of this country over and above what the Government itself could build the post offices for.

There is no saving under the President's plan. Whether the money is raised by conventional Federal financing or by lease-purchase, a form of installment plan, the taxpayers will foot the whole bill over a period of time. But, lease-purchase makes the buildings far more expensive than conventional Government financing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD certain paragraphs from the debate we had on this matter from April 20, 1954. What a group of us said on that date is as true and applicable today to this latest representation on the part of the President of the United States—that he is not really proposing a public-works program, when all it is is a shakedown of the taxpayers of the country.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF April 20, 1954]

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should first like to conclude my statement; then I shall be happy to yield.

If the Federal Government needs a building, it should come to Congress and ask it to appropriate the money for it. That is the cheapest way to do it. If we cannot afford to do it that way, why enact a bill like this and pile up the costs to which I am about to refer under this method, which the

committee itself says is more costly than the old method?

The committee has provided no estimate as to what the program will cost. I was curious on that point. I thought the Senate should have some information to guide it in its deliberations on this measure. Therefore I asked the Library of Congress to provide me with some figures. To me they are most interesting. Let me demonstrate what I mean.

We are talking about saving money. Yet we are presented with a program which will be much more costly than any other program.

Estimates as to the amount of construction which would take place under this bill vary. Some have quoted a figure as high as \$3 billion. For purposes of illustration, I have assumed that \$900 million worth of construction would take place under this program.

All of us know that a builder will not construct a Federal building without making a profit. I am assuming that he would make a profit of approximately 10 percent, which is the average profit on construction. Under the proposed lease-purchase program the builders—and I ask Senators to mark this point—would go to their bankers to borrow the money. Naturally, they would borrow enough to cover their estimated costs, or \$900 million, plus a legitimate profit. For easy figuring, let us assume the builders borrow \$1 billion. This amount would cover the cost of construction, plus the profit. Collectively, the mortgage total would be \$1 billion.

I doubt that the interest rate on these mortgages would be less than 4½ percent. That is the normal, average rate of interest on money lent for construction purposes. Let us assume that the rate is 4½ percent, and that the lease-purchase contract runs for 25 years. The total cost of these buildings to Uncle Sam would be \$1,686,000,000, in round figures, as compared to \$900 million under the straight appropriation method. The amount of \$686 million is the amount of interest the taxpayers will pay on a program of the magnitude I am discussing.

The annual payment to amortize the cost of the buildings, plus interest over a 25-year period, would be \$67,439,000.

Let us assume that the Federal Government were to finance the same building program by appropriations, which is the honest way to do it. The cost of the money to the Government would be not more than 2½ percent. It would be in the ratio of whatever the deficit of the Federal Government was for the fiscal year. It would be less than that, but let us assume it would be 2½ percent. Over a 25-year period the interest charge would be \$357 million in round figures.

In other words, it would cost Uncle Sam, at the highest figure we could assume, \$329 million more in interest alone to finance a \$1 billion construction program under this proposed legislation than it would cost if Congress made the appropriations directly.

That is quite a tribute to pay to the moneylenders, particularly at a time when we hear so much talk about economizing. In addition, it is an extremely high price to pay in the name of a balanced budget for the sake of a balanced budget.

Let us assume that the money costs the builder 5 percent. In that case the total interest the Federal Government would ultimately pay on a \$1 billion construction program would amount to \$774,855,000. In that case the buildings would cost the taxpayers \$418 million more in interest than they would cost if Congress appropriated the funds.

If builders had to pay 5½ percent for their money, the difference in cost would be \$507 million. The total interest would be \$864 million, in round figures.

This, however, is not the full story. We still have to consider taxes. Under this bill the title would not pass to the Federal Government until final payment is made.

In consequence, the builder would pay local taxes on the property. The property with improvements would remain on the tax rolls.

This may be a desirable provision. Many of us in the Senate have thought the Federal Government should make some payments in lieu of taxes to States and municipalities. Under the Constitution, however, States and political subdivisions may not impose a tax on the Federal Government. This bill provides a backdoor method for permitting the Federal Government—through annual installments on lease-purchase buildings—to pay the taxes.

I am not arguing the merits or demerits of the proposition. I now merely want to demonstrate the additional cost to the Federal Government of acquiring buildings under this legislation attributable to local taxes.

For illustrative purposes, I have taken two cities—Seattle and Baltimore—on opposite sides of the country. I realize, of course, that the Federal Government is not going to acquire a billion dollars worth of construction in Baltimore or in Seattle. The property tax rates in those two cities, however, will demonstrate the point I am making.

In the State of Washington we have a constitutional limitation on real estate taxes of 40 mills. Assessment valuations are made at 50 percent of true value. On a billion dollars worth of construction, therefore, the annual real estate tax will amount to \$20 million. Over a 25-year period these taxes would add \$500 million to the cost of these buildings.

In addition, there are local levies. In Seattle they amounted to \$6.60 per thousand in 1953. Assuming this rate will continue, this would add another \$165 million, or a total of \$665 million in taxes over 25 years.

Mr. President, that is probably more than the cost of the buildings themselves.

In Baltimore, the rate is \$20.80 per thousand. Assessments are supposed to be made at 75 percent of value. The annual taxes on a billion dollars' worth of construction would be \$21,600,000. Over a 25-year period taxes would increase the cost to the Federal Government by \$540 million.

Let us go back and figure out what the total additional cost of a billion dollars' worth of construction would be, taking into consideration the additional interest charge and the additional tax bill.

Assuming that builders acquired their money at 4½ percent, it will be remembered that the additional cost was \$329 million in round numbers.

If the construction took place in Seattle, or in a comparable city, the increase in cost under this proposed legislation would be—in taxes plus interest—\$329 million plus \$665 million, or \$994 million.

If the construction took place in Baltimore, or in a city of comparable circumstances, the total additional cost would be \$329 million, plus \$540 million, or \$869 million.

If the money cost the builders 5 percent, an additional \$89 million, in round figures, would have to be added. If money cost 5½ percent, \$168 million would be added.

It is apparent from the figures I have cited that construction under this program is going to cost the taxpayers almost double what it would cost them if Congress appropriated the funds—figuring interest and taxes alone. The committee was certainly correct when it said in its report that the appropriation method of constructing Federal buildings is the cheaper.

Over and above the costs I have mentioned, there are other hidden costs which

I think will increase Uncle Sam's outlay under this program.

Personally, I think there will be a strong inclination on the part of the Postmaster General and the General Services Administrator, to acquire by lease-purchase buildings which will incorporate more frills and furnishings than will be necessary to meet an agency's needs. There would be strong incentive to add features that really are not necessary.

It is like buying an automobile or a refrigerator or a gas or electric stove on time. The customer tends to purchase something more expensive than he can actually afford. All of us do that when we purchase on the installment plan. It is simply human nature. There is no way of estimating the cost that would be added from this source. In my judgment, however, it would be substantial.

Furthermore, I find nothing in this bill which requires General Services Administration or the Post Office Department to prepare its own designs. The bill and report speak of competitive bidding, but actually the only way we can have competitive bidding is if all the parties are preparing their estimates on the same set of plans.

Under this program a 25-year contract can be entered into by negotiation. Since the individual builder will be submitting his own set of plans, there is in reality no competitive bidding in the true sense of the word. The Federal agencies will be merely checking on the estimates the builder and his architect have prepared.

Let us assume that three contractors bid on a post office in Seattle. As this bill is drawn, the Postmaster General or Administrator of General Services could decide that the contractor with the fanciest set of plans should get the award. As I said before, there would be an actual incentive to do that because the day of reckoning would be postponed and because Congress would not have the check on the executive branch that it would have if the appropriations were made directly.

I raise these questions:

Does the Senate of the United States want to authorize payment of taxes to States and their political subdivisions by way of this lease-purchase bill?

Second. Do we need these buildings so badly that we are willing to pay tribute in the magnitude I have already mentioned—namely, \$329 million in additional interest over a 25-year period on a billion-dollar construction program?

There is still one other thing I want to mention. The committee reports say that "the General Services Administrator would make use of this legislation when (1) there is no suitable Government-owned space available, (2) there is no prospect of direct Federal construction within a reasonable period of time."

Mr. President, the General Services Administrator has to be a crystal ball gazer to figure that one out. Supposedly he will look into his crystal ball and decide that "there is no prospect of direct Federal appropriation." He will go into a seance with himself and decide that Congress is in no mood to appropriate money or that the President and his Bureau of Budget are pennypinchers, and, hence, that he should construct buildings under this proposed legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me finish one paragraph, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, the executive branch is deciding what the Congress will or will not do. The only way to ascertain what the Congress will do is to come before Congress with a sensible program and talk to us about it. If the need is great, Congress will appropriate—provided, of course, the executive branch is not more interested in claiming a

balanced budget than in achieving real economy.

Mr. President, I wish to digress at this point. The only purpose of a bill in which the Government will get \$900 million worth of buildings in 25 years, while the taxpayers will have paid more than \$2 billion for the buildings, is merely to show that it is not necessary for the executive departments to come before Congress and to ask to have the money appropriated. That is the only purpose of the bill. I could say some other things about the bill, just as the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has done on several occasions.

There is now in progress an investigation with respect to Federal housing. Unless I am wrong, if the building program is started under the provisions of the bill, future investigations of abuses and costs to the taxpayers will make the Federal Housing Administration investigation look like a Sunday-school picnic.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I share the viewpoint expressed by the Senator from Washington. In my judgment, not only is this a form of unnecessary subsidy, but really, in the long run, it will prove to be a form of extortion, so far as the taxpayers are concerned.

SPUTNIK AND AMERICAN EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published as a part of my remarks a very penetrating and able article by Dr. Earl McGrath, former United States Commissioner of Education, entitled "Sputnik and American Education." I read only the first paragraph, and then call attention to one other item, as I am speaking within a time limit.

The first paragraph of the article reads:

Every thoughtful American is properly concerned about the meaning of the Russian dramatic success in putting a satellite in orbit 560 miles from the surface of the earth. Many are worried about the military significance of this epoch-making feat. They foresee hydrogen bombs being dropped from a similar instrument into the midst of our cities and the devastation and death of Hiroshima multiplied a thousand times. They also share a common humiliation when they realize that our Nation, which has boasted the greatest wealth, the most education, and the largest force of skilled workmen, has been forced into second place in at least one very important area of scientific and technological development.

Later in the article he points out:

Scientists must be free to investigate. The Federal Government can also increase scientific production by adopting policies consistent with the nature of science and congenial to the scientists' methods of working.

In this article he bears out what a great physicist from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology said at a luncheon a few days ago as he briefed a group of us. He pointed out that security relations we have imposed on scientists have already cost us one generation of scientists, on the basis of education of nuclear physicists.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPUTNIK AND AMERICAN EDUCATION

(By Dr. Earl McGrath)

Every thoughtful American is properly concerned about the meaning of the Russian dramatic success in putting a satellite in orbit 560 miles from the surface of the earth. Many are worried about the military significance of this epoch-making feat. They foresee hydrogen bombs being dropped from a similar instrument into the midst of our cities and the devastation and death of Hiroshima multiplied a thousand times. They also share a common humiliation when they realize that our Nation, which has boasted the greatest wealth, the most education, and the largest force of skilled workmen, has been forced into second place in at least one very important area of scientific and technological development.

There is no question that being outstripped by the Russians in these scientific developments has placed us in a weakened military position. The Gaither Committee says that the Nation is in the gravest danger in its history exposed as it is to an almost immediate threat from the missile-bristling Soviet Union.

Perhaps an even more serious loss is the almost irreparable damage to our prestige in the family of nations. In terms of status and the ability to gain the support of other nations through admiration or intimidation, the Russians have made a grand slam.

But viewed from another position, Russia's launching of sputnik may be a real boon to the United States. The only constructive attitude to take is to view it as a challenge rather than a disaster. It should make us realize that in one realm of creative intellectual endeavor at least one nation has surpassed us. It should warn us that the present dramatic success of the Russians in the science of space is probably only the forerunner of many others equally impressive. The Russian intention to surpass us in other scientific fields is made abundantly clear in the recent statement of Alexander N. Nesmeyanov, chairman of the Soviet Academy of Science, when he said that "great efforts are still needed to beat the United States on all scientific fronts." It should make us realize, therefore, that no crash program in the intellectual realm will quickly reestablish our scientific supremacy, for the Russians are doubtless already husbanding a large stockpile of new ideas and plans to be used in accelerating their scientific advance.

As is our custom as a people, we think immediately of a crash program, an intensive and arresting effort to deal swiftly with a serious problem. Our Government must, of course, give prompt attention to plans for reestablishing our competitive advantage in the military arena. We must exploit quickly all the scientific knowledge and skills available in the production of weapons of offense and defense.

Fortunately, however, our people are exhibiting an immense amount of understanding in recognizing that the solution of our present difficulties related to sputnik calls for something more than larger funds for the military to build bigger and better satellites. Even though not in possession of all the facts, our citizens intuitively realize that the causes of our inadequacy must be fathomed in more complex social forces. While making every effort to defend ourselves militarily, it is with matters of social values, political institutions, and educational practices that we must be primarily concerned if the gap between our own scientific developments and those of Russia is to be closed. Only thus can we be certain that the next generation now in our schools and colleges will not find itself more embarrassed on the international scene and more insecure at home than our own.

WE CANNOT USE RUSSIAN METHODS TO OVERTAKE THEM

In dealing with the present situation the first major fact to be considered is that we cannot match the Russians in science and technology, or in any other endeavor, by adopting their own practices. To the extent that we ape them we will be losing the cold war by turning our own democratic state into a totalitarian society as we began to do under McCarthyism. The spectacular speed with which the Russians have been able to outstrip us in some areas of science can be explained in large part by the power Soviet leaders have over the private lives of the Russian people. Unlimited money can be poured into salaries, buildings, libraries, and equipment. Individuals can be tested, classified, and ordered into any program of studies deemed by the leaders to be of use to the state.

We can do none of these things. To the extent that we adopt such measures we do become a totalitarian society. In the present situation, therefore, we cannot through the powers of the state drag scientists into Government research and the production of satellites. We cannot arbitrarily restrict the production of consumer goods in the interest of a military buildup. We cannot commandeer students into classes in science or engineering, without regard to their personal occupational choice. To do these things even in the emergency we now face would be to abandon our most cherished personal freedoms while embracing the most repugnant controls of the totalitarian state. Reason and persuasion, not coercion and control, must be our methods. Hence, the success of our efforts will depend upon the promptness and effectiveness with which our officers of Government make known to the public generally the exact situation in which we now find ourselves, and the sacrifices of luxuries, comforts, and treasure required to meet this emergency. To this kind of candid appeal our people will, as they have in the past, respond with unselfish dedication to the problem at hand.

Within the context of our pattern of living what can be done to meet the present challenge? More importantly, what can we do to guarantee an adequate future supply of intellectually elite in all the phases of our national life? There are many answers to these two questions. Since education is basic to most, I will concentrate on changes in our educational enterprise best calculated to regain for us a position of intellectual leadership in the world.

THERE CAN BE NO CRASH PROGRAM IN EDUCATION

First, with regard to the immediate future. It must be recognized at the outset that there can be no such thing as a crash program in education. Education is a slow process at best, and regrettably we have not been operating our educational system at its potential best. Within limits, learning can be speeded up by exceptional teaching, increased motivation, and wise guidance, and students can be saturated with facts in a relatively brief time. But this process does not cultivate the powers of reflection, imagination, and reasoning without which one can hardly be called educated. Moreover, the latter attributes of mind are the very qualities needed in the kind of scientific research which has given the Russians their present lead.

The best one can hope for in the form of a crash program then is limited to the shifting of persons with the necessary abilities from activities of relatively low value in the present emergency to those of top priority. These efforts can be accompanied by the acceleration of the education of those who are near the end of their advanced formal education. The great benefits which would automatically flow from an improvement of education at the lower levels must

be scheduled in terms of 10 to 20 years. The recent drastic proposals for changes in the content and the methods of education in our elementary and secondary schools, even if they had merit, and many have none, would not help in the near future. Some, for example, are proposing more science and mathematics from the early grades through high school, heavier assignments in school and out, more rigorous discipline throughout the system, required instruction for all in science and mathematics through the college years, an elimination of vocational studies, and a host of other panaceas. None of these suggestions will help at all in the present emergency.

The men and women who contributed most to the recent startling scientific accomplishments in Russia were not school boys or even recent graduates of the universities. They were scientists ripe in learning, mature scholars capable of doing and understanding the most advanced research. Though a few may have been relatively young, the educational programs they had completed beyond the elementary school would cover not less and usually much more than 12 years, to which years of further education in research were doubtless added. It is obvious, therefore, that proposals, however meritorious, relating to the early years of schooling can be of little help in offsetting the initial advantage which Russian scientists now apparently hold.

WE MUST SHIFT SCIENTISTS FROM NONESSENTIAL ACTIVITIES

The only way to increase the quantity and quality of basic research in the immediate future is to make better use of the scientists already capable of adding to the store of theoretical knowledge. This plan would involve identifying the persons who have already had the essential formal education and moving them into research work related more closely to the national welfare than their present activities.

There has been much talk since World War II of the shortage of engineers and scientists. No doubt there are such shortages in some branches of business, industry, government, and the universities. Yet there is considerable evidence to show that if engineers and scientists were more effectively used these shortages would markedly shrink. Even though shortages do exist, the figures provided by the National Research Council for the years 1945 to 1955 inclusive show that 1,762 persons received the doctor of philosophy degree in mathematics, 4,175 in physics, and 9,027 in chemistry in the universities of the United States. In the same period, several hundred thousand degrees were awarded in engineering. There is no way to determine the intellectual quality of these persons, nor to compare it with the quality of Russian scientists. How many of our scientists are capable of genuinely original research no one can say. It is certain, however, that a large percentage of very high-grade scientists have trained for research and are now employed in some branch of our economy.

The significant fact, however, is that too few qualified scientists have been engaged in research even remotely related to the chemical, physical, or mathematical problems involved in satellite development, or in any other efforts to advance theoretical knowledge. Indeed, most of them are not engaged in any investigations which could conceivably result in a major breakthrough in theory. Many are devoting their intellectual energies to perfecting new computing machines, discovering more effective detergents, or developing a more resilient automobile spring. Russian scientists, on the other hand, have been driven into pure research by the authority of the state or lured into it by large financial rewards and high social status. In this country the salaries paid to scholars and the relatively low prestige of the intel-

lectual have forced many of our best minds in science into industry. There the financial reward is from two to five times that of university teachers and research workers, and there they can disguise their intellectualism. The first critical factor in our present inferior position is clearly a matter of values, the things we prize enough to pay for and to honor. When we consider sputniks and all the other potential products of theoretical science as valuable as new automobiles and improved nylon stockings, when we respect intellectual accomplishment, then we will be able, with our enormous wealth and educated manpower, again to gain the lead in the world of science, and other cultural enterprises.

Until a well-planned, long-range educational program has redressed our present weaknesses, drastic decisions will have to be made by our Government and by our people regarding the place and the use of scientists in our society. For years there has been a roster of scientific personnel in this country. The amount and kind of their education, their present place of employment, the type of work they are engaged in, and a host of other relevant facts are available. If, as Dr. Teller says, we are 10 years behind the Russians, the Government ought at once to canvass our needs for scientists and establish procedures for shifting them from activities with relatively low social value to those which could restore our scientific supremacy.

Unlike the Russians, we cannot order scientists to leave industrial, teaching, or governmental research of certain types and to enter upon others closely related to the national welfare. We can, however, publicize the need, exhort industries to release such persons as are qualified and required, and provide salaries and working conditions which will attract the most imaginative minds and the most dedicated scholars. A mustering of the large corps of talented scientists already available will carry us through this trying period until a larger group of promising young scholars can be recruited and trained. The strongest argument with industries should be that the practical problems with which they deal can only be solved and new processes and products developed on the basis of pure research which at the outset may appear to have no immediate value or purpose. In a nation as wealthy as the United States there is, of course, no reason why the supply of scientists and all other highly educated personnel cannot be adequate to all the needs of industry, government, and the universities. But even with clarity of purpose and energetic efforts, this goal cannot be reached for 10 or 15 years because of the time required in the process of education.

THE GRADUATE STUDENT MUST BE BETTER PAID

A second effort to produce an early increase in scientific personnel relates to the salaries of graduate students and professors. Through the National Science Foundation and some corporations a considerable number of well-paying fellowships have been provided for graduate students of small means. Those granted by the many corporations, however, are frequently restricted to use in research projects connected with the production processes in specific industries. Hence, the type of investigation needed for the expansion of theoretical knowledge in mathematics and science, the new body of knowledge from which satellites are born, has not been sufficiently supported. For the same reason, it would be unwise to focus too sharply on our scientific needs related to satellites. It is important to remember that the Russians are, as Dr. Nesmeyanov says, working as diligently in other scientific fields, such as biology and nuclear physics, as in astronautics. Since we do not know the areas in which new scientific developments may occur in Russia, both industry and government must contemplate large-

scale support of a well-rounded research program.

Fortunately the fellowship program of the National Science Foundation and some of the military research programs have had this broad objective in view. The stipends awarded to graduate students, most of whom are married and have families, must be the equivalent of full-time salaries so that the student will neither be delayed in his education by outside work nor harassed by privation and insecurity. The salaries of fellows of demonstrated promise should be from five to ten thousand dollars a year for a period of 3 or even 5 years if a particular research project requires a longer period to be brought to completion.

PROFESSORS' SALARIES MUST BE DOUBLED

The low financial reward for those who teach and do research is another real bottleneck in scientific developments in the United States. Indeed, this factor is the basic cause of the crippled condition of our educational system from the first grade through the graduate and professional schools. But in the fields of mathematics and science the situation is particularly acute because the competition for the ablest scholars is intensified by opportunities in government, business, and industry. Most college or university presidents have had the experience of having a science teacher come into his office to say that he had had an offer in industry. Since the salary is twice or three times as large as his academic compensation, he feels he cannot turn the opportunity down. He generally adds that he likes academic life, but that he has to consider the welfare of his family. On an academic salary he finds it impossible to buy a suitable house, carry adequate insurance to protect his loved ones, take a vacation, or send his sons and daughters to college.

Seductive financial appeals from industry where the higher salaries can merely be added to the cost of production and passed on to the consumer, or deducted from taxes, have resulted in the educational world's continuous loss of many of the most able, imaginative, and dynamic scholars. That so many able persons remain in academic work in spite of low salaries is testimony to their high-mindedness and their dedication to youth and to the Nation. Until the professors who must produce the scientists the country so desperately needs receive salaries of from \$25,000 to \$30,000, roughly comparable to the compensation of their peers in the business world, the supply of topflight scientists able to teach their successor and able to do research will simply not be available. The proposal that academic people ought to have larger salaries is neither new nor radical. Now, however, since the scientific achievements of the Russians have shocked our people into an awareness of the present danger, it may be hoped that concern for the national welfare will galvanize public leaders inside and outside the Government into action to correct the present inequities.

FEDERAL GRANTS FOR SALARIES AND FOR PHYSICAL FACILITIES

In this connection it might be instructive to study the salaries and the social status of scholars in Russia to determine the possible influence of these rewards on the size and the quality of the academic guild. It is reported that Russian professors receive from 5 to 10 times as much salary as ordinary workmen. In our country there is little difference between the two groups except in the cases of the most accomplished men and women in the world of learning. Since many universities are incapable of meeting their current financial obligations without large deficit spending no spectacular increases in salaries can be expected without large additional resources. The Federal Government will have to provide a large part of these

funds if the Russian lead in science is to be nullified.

Other policies of the Government can be equally effective in holding fledgling or mature scientists in basic research. In addition to supplying funds for satisfactory salaries for research workers, the Government ought to develop long-range programs for the support of higher education involving substantial grants to universities for science buildings and equipment. Universities cannot be expected to bring into their faculties highly paid professors and to supply the needed expensive facilities on the basis of uncertain commitments renewable from year to year. The Congress has the power and the responsibility to make large sums available to institutions of higher education over a 5- to 10-year period. If this were done the income from Government sources could be foreseen with reasonable accuracy and the financial obligations of these institutions stabilized.

SCIENTISTS MUST BE FREE TO INVESTIGATE

The Federal Government can also increase scientific production by adopting policies consistent with the nature of science and congenial to the scientists' methods of working. Science flowers under conditions of unrestricted investigation and freedom of communication. Actions of government or of citizens generally which restrain the individual scientist's freedom of inquiry or the interchange of his ideas with other scientists impairs the total scientific enterprise. In the present situation, such practices actually undermine the national welfare.

Some practices of Congressional committees and of the executive branch of the Government have, in recent years, violated the basic principles of scientific inquiry. The motives and the patriotism of scholars have been impugned, their characters maligned, and their livelihood endangered by governmental bodies. Personal injury and the abridgment of constitutional freedoms have been accompanied by damage to our scientific efforts. These activities have driven out of essential scientific investigation many capable scholars. Nobody can possibly measure the damage to our national defense effort and to the well-being of our scientific enterprise caused by Senator McCarthy and his supporters. That it was considerable, however, no objective analyst of our present weakened position can doubt. Scholars must be freed from interference in their work and we need to reappraise the place of the intellectual in our society. The so-called egghead ought to be honored rather than lampooned. It is now literally true that only he can lead us out of our present dangerous situation.

WHERE HAVE 20TH-CENTURY LEADERS IN SCIENCE COME FROM?

These proposals for immediate action related to the parts industry, government, and citizens generally can play in strengthening the scientific enterprise should be paralleled by changes within the educational system itself. One such action is concerned with the graduate schools of universities, the institutions which produce scholars in all fields of learning, including the sciences and mathematics.

Since the beginning of this century our universities have produced many renowned scientists. The names of Michelson, Millikan, Compton, Lawrence, and others amply prove the point. But in terms of the percentage of our people who have had the advantages of higher education, the record compared to that of other countries is disappointing. When one reviews the major scientific advances since 1901, the names of Lorentz, Becquerel, Curie, Planck, Einstein, Bohr, Heisenberg, Schrodinger, and Fermi make it obvious that the products of foreign education have occupied the center of the stage. Even some of our most distinguished scientists like Millikan received their advanced

education in foreign universities. Our failure to produce enough highly imaginative, inventive research scholars must in considerable part be the result of defects in our educational system.

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY EDUCATION NEEDS TO BE OVERHAULED

Weaknesses in the lower schools deserve serious attention. But the element of time demands that the shortcomings of graduate education be given first consideration. The plain fact is that graduate education in the United States has not sufficiently encouraged creative intellectual achievement. A significant percentage of those who obtain the Ph. D. degree are neither seriously interested in adding to human knowledge nor capable of doing so. The practices and policies of graduate education encourage routine intellectual processes. As they enter upon their first test of creative intellectual ability many are given a problem closely related to a professor's own research. The techniques, apparatus, and library resources required to explore the problem are suggested by a senior research worker. Often the dissertation is to a large extent written by the sponsor.

A few years ago the longtime head of a physics department in a prominent State university was asked what percentage of those who had received the doctor of philosophy degree in his time had had the imagination to find a problem worthy of study and had then carried their research project through to completion with a minimum of direction from a senior colleague. His estimate was 1 in 10. That this may have been a general situation is suggested by studies of the scholarly production of mathematicians and historians which showed that only 15 to 20 percent of those who receive doctor of philosophy degrees in these fields thereafter ever do any significant research. For too many, their professional education as scholars is not an exciting, intellectual experience. It is not one in which the individual loses himself in a work of consuming interest. It is not viewed as it may well now be, as an effort which could determine the future destiny of the Nation and of the world.

The processes of graduate education are burdened with traditional and meaningless requirements. They include a given number of years of study in residence, the superficial study of foreign languages which almost none can then use, and a system of academic book-keeping in which the number of hours of work completed in the classroom or laboratory rather than measures of genuine intellectual growth and power determine the outcome. These requirements, extraneous to true scholarship, dampen intellectual enthusiasm and stifle scholarly accomplishment. Additional handicaps are imposed by the student's needs to make a living through outside work.

As Dean Barzun, of Columbia University, has pointed out, these encumbrances and interruptions often extend the graduate experience to 5 or even 10 years. And more importantly, the total impact of this experience which should excite the intellect, quicken perception, and embolden the spirit of inquiry, actually often leaves the finished product weary in mind, body, and spirit.

The entire program of graduate education needs immediate reappraisal. Those of superior intellectual gifts should be admitted earlier, unburdened of meaningless rules and regulations, freed from monetary worries, and charged with a passionate devotion to the search for truth. Though the immediate purpose in these changes may necessarily be the preservation of the Nation, as I believe, the long-range objective should be to create a more vital system of higher education. To gain this end will require, however, an overhauling of the entire structure and practice of graduate education in the United States, with the national interest taking precedence over vested academic interests. Tinkering

will not do. To change the residence requirements from 60 to 55 credits, to permit graduate students to satisfy the language requirement by studying Russian instead of German, to raise graduate stipends from \$2,500 to \$3,000, and to make other trivial alterations will be to proceed in the laborious manner customary in academic life. The times urgently require a more critical assessment of present practice and a more dynamic program for its improvement.

The actions thus far proposed can be taken immediately to meet the Soviet challenge. In a period of from 5 to 10 years they could result in a rapid acceleration of basic scientific discovery. Whether these changes can be speeded up in time to avoid a disastrous attack on the United States is a question which only history can answer.

Only a long-range program, however, extending over a period of several generations, can vouchsafe a world in which our children and their children can enjoy the freedoms which we have known. The crucial element in any such program to strengthen the position of the Nation in science, and in many other aspects of our common life, is the quality of our entire educational system. The people of the United States from the very beginning have had an abiding faith in the value of education. The constant extension of the opportunity for education to larger and larger numbers of youth is tangible evidence of this deep-seated conviction.

But our present embarrassment stems partly from the fact that this idealistic conception has not been matched by a willingness to pay for its realization. The actual dollars spent for education of all kinds have increased from 6 billion in 1940 to 16 billion in 1955. In the same period, however, the number of children to be served and the cost of operation have skyrocketed. The supply of teachers and buildings has not kept pace. A gradual deterioration of education for millions of children has been the result. In many communities half-day sessions, classes of 40 or more pupils, unqualified teachers on emergency certificates, classes in stores, factories, and church basements have been the order of the day. This educational privation is found primarily in the poorer States and communities. But in the past 10 years, the press has carried many stories of wealthy communities in which school taxes and bond issues have been voted down, communities in which the 2-car family, the well-filled wine cellar, and the summer home at the shore are typical rather than exceptional. The financial plight of many colleges and universities both public and private presents a similarly disheartening picture.

In attempting to place our scientific enterprise on a level with the Russians, to say nothing of improving the other essential social services which require advanced education, our first decision will have to be our willingness to pay the bill. The Russians some years ago recognized that world supremacy in science could only be achieved by sacrificing other satisfactions in favor of more and better education. Comparable figures are not easy to obtain, but informed persons believe that the Russians are putting a much larger percentage of their available national resources into education than we are. In any event, our unwillingness to spend more than 3 or 4 percent of the gross national product of over \$400 billion dollars for all forms of education is the seat of many of our present difficulties.

We will not come abreast of the Russians—indeed, we will continuously fall further behind them—until the educational budget is materially raised. When teachers' salaries attract the most capable of our young people into the profession, when the school plant is modernized and equipped with tested teaching materials, when American children attend school for a full day under

skilled teachers, when the majority of our colleges and universities are no longer limping along on large deficits, when all young people of college age are able to get a higher education suited to their abilities, then we can expect the educational system adequately to serve our needs in the domestic and international spheres.

In recent years there have been loud voices criticizing American education. Sputnik has joined these voices in a chorus of lamentation. The main theme is that, because of modern educational theory, pupils in our schools have been encouraged not to study such difficult studies as mathematics and the sciences. Statistics have been cited to show the falling enrollments in these subjects in our high schools. The most impressive and also the most misleading of these presentations appeared in U. S. News & World Report in an interview with Prof. Arthur E. Bestor of the University of Illinois. The statistics cited purport to show a shocking drop since the turn of the century in the percentage of high-school students studying science and mathematics. Prof. Harold C. Hand of the same university has shown, however, that, contrary to the figures of Dr. Bestor, the percentage of students taking science in high school has not dropped from 84 in 1900 to 54 in 1950, and in mathematics from 86 to 55. On the contrary, the percentages have risen from 84 to 98 in science, and from 86 to 90 in mathematics. Moreover, the high-school population has increased from 519,251 in 1900 to 5,399,452 in 1950. A percentage of over 90 in each subject in 1950, therefore, means a tremendous increase in the number of students studying these subjects. Even after eliminating those who have no special aptitude for, or interest in, a scientific career, this is a large reservoir from which to draw 10,000 potential doctors of philosophy in physics, chemistry, and mathematics; more than the total of doctor of philosophy degrees granted in these fields from 1945 to 1955.

The number could and should be larger. There are several obstacles to the attainment of this goal. The first is the size of our high schools. In 1952, 824 high schools had fewer than 25 students. Thirty percent had enrollments under 100. When these students are distributed over a 4-year period, and the dropouts from the freshman to the senior year are taken into consideration, it is apparent that a large percentage of American high schools simply do not have enough students to offer instruction in the sciences, especially those requiring a laboratory. Even in advanced mathematics, the demand does not warrant such instruction in many of the small school districts.

Furthermore, in small high schools it is not possible to have specialized teachers in all subjects such as chemistry, mathematics, physics, English, history, foreign languages, vocational courses, and the other subjects usually provided in a large, comprehensive high school in an urban center. Consequently, teachers whose main interest and training is in literature or social studies may be required to teach science. This instruction is sometimes inferior. The National Science Foundation has launched a number of programs to upgrade these teachers, as well as those originally qualified in science but whose training needs to be brought up to date on the latest recent scientific developments.

For many years educators have earnestly urged the establishment of larger school units. They have tried to persuade school boards to consolidate ineffective small school districts to make possible larger class groups with special teachers in the various high-school subjects. Many States have offered leadership and financial assistance to districts wishing to consolidate. The foregoing figures show that, because such consolida-

tions have not been effected, many American youth have inferior or no instruction. If a full complement of subject matter is desired, the establishment of larger high-school units should be pressed with all vigor.

A major difficulty in providing good instruction in science, especially in small schools, is the cost of equipment. Many colleges and high schools are deprived of such equipment by its high cost. Here the Federal Government could do something concrete to help in the present emergency. Much teaching equipment in the sciences can be purchased in European countries for a fraction of its cost in the United States. Because of high tariff rates, however, these materials cannot be acquired at the lower price. Import tariff rates are set as high as 50 percent. Educators have stated that one of the major obstacles to effective and interesting teaching in science in high schools and colleges is the lack of suitable technical equipment.

Efforts by a committee of the American Association for the Advancement of Science to get Government action to reduce import duties on these articles indispensable in good teaching have been abortive. In spite of the fact that the total value of such materials constitutes only a negligible percentage of the annual volume of business of the American firms concerned, they have vigorously fought and lobbied against any change in the tariff on these articles. Here again, it may be hoped that the urgent needs of the Nation, dramatized by sputnik, may effectuate what reason and importunity could not. If the United States Government is serious about its desire to advance the cause of science quickly and materially a reduction in the tariff on scientific apparatus is an easy and inexpensive way to do so.

Even in the high schools where mathematics and science are now being taught, the number of students taking such courses can be significantly increased, and the quality of learning improved. Certain policies and practices have militated against a full enlistment of the interests of students who are capable of higher education, especially in the subjects with which we are now concerned. The preparatory basic instruction in some elementary schools has not been as effective as it could be. Hence, some students come unprepared for and afraid of courses in the sciences and mathematics. Moreover, the reputation which these courses have in many high schools and colleges, because of uninspired and uninspiring teaching, causes many students to avoid them. The guidance programs in some schools fail to identify and guide promising students into the proper courses. The schools can do much to improve science teaching.

One of the most significant factors in this—the failure of students to elect science courses—is totally beyond the control of the schools. That is the attitudes of parents. The fact is that many students, when possible, avoid subjects which require hard work and long hours of study. Many members of the teaching profession have been more tolerant of this attitude than is good for the student or for the country. Often, however, the basic factor in the student's desire to take an easy course is the attitude of the parents who do not want their children to do more than the minimum of study to get through. Many are more interested in having their children get a diploma or a degree than an education. This point of view has been more influential in undermining standards of accomplishment and discipline in the schools than the philosophy of John Dewey. Dewey was an ardent advocate of self-discipline and the exertion of effort toward well-defined goals, as his own life so abundantly illustrated. He was opposed to dull routine, memorization of facts, and the authoritarian discipline imposed

without reason. He rightly believed that learning was most effective when self-motivated.

Parents can inspire an interest in learning by valuing it as an indispensable element in a good life and a necessary factor in a healthy society. When parents are as proud of their son's grades in academic subjects as they are of his throwing the pass that won the game on Saturday or of his playing the trombone in the high-school band, more students will study science with more interest and more success. With full cooperation between teachers and parents many more students of appropriate abilities and interests will find their way into courses in science and mathematics and all the other fields of study of equal value in a vital and growing democratic society.

One proposal of increasing popularity to meet the shortages in the sciences involves requirements for all students in certain subject-matter fields. In its most extreme form, the several States are asked to pass laws requiring all students to study science and mathematics. This suggestion is ill-advised. In the first place, it is a modified form of the Russian system of regimentation and of coercion which is repugnant to Americans. Second, many students by disposition and vocational interest are unable to profit as much from such instruction as they could from others. Third, there is great danger that in the hysteria of the moment we will impose policies and practices which will make intellectual and emotional misfits of a considerable number of our people. We can also create a lopsided society in which science overbalances all the humane and social disciplines of equal if not greater value in the resolution of our domestic and international problems.

The alternative to a universal requirement is a sensitive testing of all pupils in the early years of schooling to discover the student's abilities and interests. This program needs to be coupled with an efficient guidance and counseling service to get students into a type of advanced education congenial to their abilities and conducive to satisfying achievement. Such a program will produce more and better scientists than compulsory study in fields for which the student has little aptitude or interest. It will also produce a balanced supply of satisfied workers in all other fields which are equally essential in a dynamic and well-rounded society.

To provide the maximum number of superior high school students for higher education in the minimum time consistent with their abilities and their health, these students should be identified earlier than is now uniformly the practice. They should be guided into the courses needed for college admission, and speeded on their way to an even tentatively established educational goal. A mistaken notion concerning the nature of a democratic school system has operated to prevent the application of these conceptions in the everyday program of the schools. Whether we like it or not there are wide differences among students in ability, interests, and the desire to excel in intellectual achievement. No eutenic or eugenic program is likely to erase these human variations in the visible future. Some teachers and school administrators have adopted or condoned practices which seem to recognize these individual differences only at the lower end of the ability scale. They favor individual attention and special treatment for those of below average ability and many programs have been established for this purpose. They have been less aggressive in recognizing students of unusual talents and providing special treatment for those who have potentially the greatest contribution to make to American society. I believe that our people are ready for such developments. The quicker we identify the most capable students in all intellectual

spheres and provide for them an accelerated and enriched program, the sooner the urgent national need for talented scientists will be met. Higher standards of accomplishment for the most capable will change education from a dull series of intellectual routines into an exciting adventure. I believe that many parents will accept this type of educational program at this time, if its plan and purpose are made clear.

Applied to educational policies, this concept of requiring the best efforts of students in terms of their capacity means that those of ability should be moved forward intellectually toward an educational goal as rapidly as possible. They should be guided into as difficult studies as they are capable of mastering, and they should avoid subject matter which needlessly dissipates their time and energy. Specifically in the case of a boy or girl who expects to enter a scientific field, the high school program should include 4 years of English, mathematics through trigonometry, 3 years of one foreign language, at least 2 years of science, and 2 years of social studies. This program would still leave two or three units for other electives. Most youth of college ability can complete such a program without harm to mind or body. Indeed, many would be better adjusted emotionally if they had a more demanding program of studies. A false notion has prevailed in the past two decades that exacting intellectual work leads to social and emotional maladjustment. There is no scientific basis for this belief. The difficulty of studies must be adjusted to the ability of students. Too easy a program is just as likely to cause maladjustment and unhappiness for superior students as too hard a program for those of limited intellectual abilities.

All the foregoing proposals, though they would provide a larger pool of qualified scientists, really leave the major long-range problem untouched. The crucial factor in the shortage of trained manpower of all types which stems from deficiencies in our educational system is our failure to support education adequately. Considered as a group, the education of our children has been deteriorating since the beginning of World War II. There are, to be sure, many school systems in the United States in which fully certified, highly competent, enthusiastic teachers conduct their classes in up-to-date, light, and fireproof schools with the best teaching materials available. As a result of the dedicated and patriotic efforts of Mr. Roy Larsen and his associates in the National Citizens' Commission for the Public Schools, many children have had better teachers in more modern schools than they would otherwise have had.

But in terms of the growing need for new classrooms and teachers, the national picture of inadequate support remains about as depressing as it was 10 years ago. The story has been told so often in the press and on the air that it need not be repeated. It is enough to say that in September 1957 the United States Commissioner of Education reported the shortage of elementary and secondary-school teachers to be 135,000. According to the figures supplied by educational authorities in the States, in the fall of 1956 there was a national shortage of 159,000 classrooms. If the fact that some classrooms now in use were built before 1900 is taken into consideration, this figure ought to be raised to 250,000, and the process of obsolescence continues apace. Since hundreds of school districts have reached their legal debt limit, the school plant cannot be improved without outside financial aid in the visible future. As a consequence of these shortages, 800,000 students attended school only a half day and 17.9 percent of the elementary-school classes in 1956 (the most recent figure available) had more than 35 children. In the cities of 500,000, over 8 percent of the classes had 40 or more children. Moreover, thousands of teachers were

on temporary emergency certificates, which means that they were unqualified in terms of accepted professional standards.

The consequences of our failure to provide the funds needed merely to bring the schools of the Nation up to normal operating efficiency, with every child receiving instruction in an acceptably modern school plant under a properly certified and adequately paid teacher, are now becoming blatantly apparent. It is in these shocking facts and figures that we should look for the causes of our weakening scientific position on the international stage. How can we expect pupils to learn as much basic arithmetic and science in half-day classes as in a full school day? How can high-school students learn the fundamentals of science when it is taught in classes of 40 or 50 by teachers whose primary intellectual interests are in other fields, in rooms not designed as laboratories and not equipped with the necessary teaching materials? How can teachers devote their undivided time, energy, and enthusiasm to their students when they must bring their income up to a living wage by driving taxicabs, selling insurance, or testing prisoners at odd hours in the local jail? It is just as foolish to expect children attending school half a day in classes of 35 or 40 under unqualified teachers to be educated for life in today's world as it would be to expect the Ford Co. to produce the Edsel in the plant of 1920 with engineers educated in 1900 with the materials of construction used in the Model T. Yet, this is the miracle some of our citizens expect school officials to perform.

Many informed and patriotic educators and laymen have been aware of the deterioration that has been occurring in the school enterprise. They pointed out a decade ago that a child's education could not be put in a deep freeze for a period of years. Their exhortations have fallen on too many deaf ears among their fellow citizens. The saddest aspect of our educational inadequacy is not yet apparent to most citizens. The children whose early education was neglected in years passed are only now beginning to show that they do not have the essential basic education for their further intellectual development. It is a national tragedy and a national scandal that little can now be done to repair these deficiencies. A considerable amount of the precious talent we need so badly in this hour has been lost forever by a callous disregard of the condition of our educational system. This situation is in strange contrast with the efforts the Russians have made to strengthen education by depriving themselves of many of the comforts not to mention the luxuries we take for granted. The disparity between our own efforts to provide basic education for all and the Russians will doubtless increase until a new generation of children passes through a strengthened and enriched educational program.

This objective can only be reached with the leadership and the resources of the Federal Government. Some local school districts and some States have adequate resources to raise teachers' salaries by 50 percent and to erect the additional classrooms to accommodate the increased school population and to replace obsolete school plants. It is their patriotic duty to do so without delay. Their best efforts, however, will leave an enormous gap between the national need for improved education and our ability to provide it on a national scale. There is no necessity to recapitulate all the irrefutable arguments for Federal aid for education. We have the necessary funds as an impartial review of the economy conclusively shows. We lack only the will of the people at large to take this step through their representatives in Washington. Both Democratic and Republican administrations have advocated various forms of Federal aid for a number

of years. These efforts have been frustrated largely by skillful and powerful lobbyists, and by the dissemination of false information among the people. As events now prove, these organizations and their richly supported lobbyists have been toying cavalierly with the welfare of the Nation. It is to be hoped that if they are not shamed by the melancholy international events of recent months into a withdrawal of their opposition to Federal aid, the people generally whose lives and welfare are in jeopardy will undoubtedly express their disapproval at the polls in November 1958.

There is no way to calculate the exact amount of Federal aid required to bring the school system of the Nation to a level of effective operation. There is also no way to determine exactly how many missiles or other forms of weapons are needed to defend the Nation against attack. This does not mean that we will delay missile programs until the last facts are available, because in a fluid situation they will never be available. Likewise, the national need for highly trained manpower can never be precisely determined. A beginning must nevertheless be made at once on the Federal level to meet the need that exists.

A modest program in terms of our national resources would be a billion dollars a year for 5 years. Testimony over the past 10 years in committees of the Congress shows conclusively that a half billion dollars a year of Federal subsidy of education within the States for current operating expenses would go far to bring teachers' salaries up to a level that would attract and hold competent and dedicated teachers. Testimony before the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor under Congressman CLEVELAND BAILEY's chairmanship in 1957 revealed that \$500 million a year of Federal funds, matched by varying contributions of States according to their financial ability would in a few years erase a large part of the deficit in school-house construction. If legislation could be passed in the next session of Congress, as it should be, embodying an aid program of this magnitude, the continuing process of erosion of our educational standards would be retarded and eventually brought to a stop. With this assistance, local schools can restore their programs to a level of effectiveness consistent with our national status and honor, and with our declared purpose of providing full educational opportunity to all children regardless of their social status or their geographical location.

Another effort to increase the pool of educated manpower can be made by the Federal Government through a substantial program of undergraduate scholarships. Numerous studies in the various States have shown that many of the upper 25 percent of high school graduates do not continue their formal education. The majority discontinue because of lack of funds. Colleges and universities in a recent year used over \$50 million of their own much-needed resources for scholarships. Some corporations and private individuals also provide large resources to assist worthy students. But there are still at least 100,000 high school graduates of high quality each year who would attend an institution of higher education if they had the funds.

In view of the national emergency the Federal Government should establish a program offering between 30,000 to 50,000 scholarships each year to students of ability. Grants under the scholarship should be at least \$1,000 a year. These funds should be distributed through State education authorities on the basis of the respective State's economic condition and the number of high school graduates. The total number of scholarships involved over a 4-year period would thus be between 120,000 and 200,000, with an eventual annual cost of between

\$120 million to \$200 million, about half the cost of one aircraft carrier.

These scholarships should be awarded to any qualifying student regardless of his intellectual interests. If, however, it is necessary to use a large proportion of the funds available for science education for a period of years a provision could be written into the law empowering the President to reserve a certain number of scholarships for students in scientific fields, including engineering. Since student fees do not cover the cost of education, and since colleges and universities are already in serious financial trouble, the institutions accepting these Federal scholarship students should receive a substantial grant as well. The total funds involved should be about 50 percent of the scholarship fund, or when it is in full operation, \$50 million annually.

In all the efforts to strengthen our position in science vis-a-vis the Russians, one concept should dominate our planning. There is a great danger that in our eagerness to move forward rapidly in science and technology we will neglect the other branches of learning that are no less important in a democratic society. There is reason to believe that the Russians are using a disproportionate share of their national resources for education in science with a consequent impoverishment of the humane disciplines which constitute the enduring basis of our culture. Such policies involve less danger in a totalitarian society in which large social policies are laid down by a small directive class. In a nation like our own, however, which from the beginning has depended upon the general enlightenment of the people for wise decisions on social and political matters, a broad education in all the major branches of knowledge is indispensable to the health of the Nation. Moreover, the enrichment of life for the individual depends no less upon his acquaintance with the literary, artistic, and philosophic heritage of western and other civilizations. Though it may be necessary in the present emergency to attract more students into scientific fields and to spend an excessive proportion of our resources for scholarships, teachers, buildings, and equipment related to science, the ongoing educational program must maintain a proper balance of learning for all enlightened citizens.

DISARMAMENT TALKS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to an editorial which appeared in the *Michigan Daily of the University of Michigan* Sunday, February 9, 1958, entitled "Tit-for-Tat in Disarmament Talks."

This editorial was written by Mr. Peter Eckstein, editor of the *Michigan Daily*. It is a thoughtful, constructive discussion of the difficult and perplexing problems surrounding disarmament negotiations. I congratulate Editor Eckstein and welcome his thoughtful study and analysis.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIT-FOR-TAT IN DISARMAMENT TALKS

What with the maze of conflicting views on disarmament being offered by Dulles, Stassen, and the Soviets, and with Adlai Stevenson proposing a world conference of respected men to formulate other views, any further suggestions may seem superfluous. But the American and Russian proposals are taking

some sort of form and may contain within them the seeds of a limited agreement.

Stassen unofficially and the Soviets officially both appear to favor separating the issue of hydrogen testing from the question of general disarmament, Stassen because he is anxious for any sort of agreement, the Russians because they realize the propaganda value of test suspension among the uncommitted peoples. The United States seems to fear test suspension will allow the Soviets to overcome our slim lead in hydrogen weapons.

Secretary Dulles in his press club speech, while sticking to an insistence on a link between the issue of nuclear weapons and general disarmament, advocated a separate agreement on control of outer space, in which the Russians have a lead. But the Russian reply has been to link space control with the issue of general disarmament.

After so many years of futile negotiations and exchanges of letters, there is no question but what there is no better way for either side to kill any idea than to insist that it only come as a part of a general agreement. Modern technology has provided small enough weapons of complete destruction and effective enough means of underground production and storage to make any system of inspection—the key to a foolproof agreement—unthinkable.

Thus while each side wants an agreement to check weapons development in the area in which the other is ahead, each side attempts to prevent an agreement which would check its progress in the area in which it is behind. This may or may not be rational: It seems to be predicated on the assumption that one can overcome the other's lead, be it in satellites or hydrogen bombs, or nullify it if only both sides stop testing. It assumes there is no advantage in freezing one's own lead in the area in which one has gained preeminence.

And both positions assume some ability to inspect, undoubtedly from some distance, the experiments of the other, which is possibly not justified for the testing of small nuclear weapons and undoubtedly not justified for the construction of space platforms or other militarily valuable outer-space devices.

But there still might be advantages—for propaganda, for economy, and even for peace—in agreements to check space and nuclear testing, especially if both sides approached such agreements with equal amounts of skepticism and credulity. And the current impasse may be the only optimistic note on the whole disarmament front, since the ideal time—if not the only time—for an effective agreement on anything is when both sides have approximately equal amounts to gain and to lose, or, more accurately, when they think they do. The Russian de facto rejection of control of outer space and the American de facto rejection of a ban on nuclear tests may eventually become the basis of a tit-for-tat bargain linking bans on nuclear tests and space weapons with each other, and not with the whole hopeless question of total disarmament.

THE ISSUES OF PEACE AND SECURITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there are two great issues before the American people today. One is the issue of peace and security. The other is the growing economic decline, the recession which has begun to make itself felt in long lines of unemployed, in reduced paychecks, and in genuine hardship throughout our country.

Yesterday I released to the press a statement commenting on the President's proposal to build postoffices as an

antirecession measure. I must say, Mr. President, that is at best but a token of recognition of the troubles facing the Nation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD this statement, entitled "Senator HUMPHREY Urges Tax Cut, School and Home Construction as Key Anti-Depression Measures."

I should add, an effective agricultural program which will at least stabilize and I trust stimulate and expand agricultural consuming power.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HUMPHREY URGES TAX CUT, SCHOOL AND HOME CONSTRUCTION AS KEY ANTI-DEPRESSION MEASURES

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, today urged the administration to "put first things first" and to set an urgent priority on a "tax cut for 1 year to stimulate purchasing power, massive school construction and slum clearance program, and income-producing public works rather than pinning all its hopes on a post-office construction program as the answer to the growing recession."

"A tax cut may temporarily reduce government revenues," Senator HUMPHREY said, "but the drop in production and jobs in the current recession will be even more costly to the Government and indeed to the people. It is better to have an unbalanced budget than an unbalanced economy; by firming up jobs, production, and construction, the budget will eventually be balanced."

The Minnesota Democrat, who introduced a school construction bill at the beginning of the 85th Congress last year, pointed out that a school construction program would provide a "very large number of individual construction projects with a minimum time delay in getting actual construction started." He urged that President Eisenhower lend his early support to the school construction legislation now pending before the Congress.

Commenting that at least the post-office construction proposal is recognition by the administration of the principle that essential public works can and should be used to stimulate the economy, Senator HUMPHREY said that the President nevertheless has ignored the two most urgent public works needs: school construction and slum clearance.

"Our people need jobs and they need tax relief to restore purchasing power," Senator HUMPHREY declared. "And at the same time we badly need more classrooms, more public housing and a strong and resolute attack on our city slums and blighted areas."

"Post offices are needed," he said, "but the administration should recognize what every parent and school child knows—that we are slipping further and further back in classroom facilities and low-income housing. It is a little hard to swallow the implication that new post offices are more important than new schools and slum clearance."

"Priority should not only be given to schools and public housing and at least a \$20 per capita cut in the personal income tax," Senator HUMPHREY declared, "but there is a broad field of income-producing public works which are also needed."

"For instance," he said, "the administration should take the brakes off rivers and harbors development for navigation improvement and public power facilities. And it should move to accelerate the highway program, which has been proceeding at a snail's pace."

"These income-producing public works will have a double effect on the economy, providing not only a 'shot in the arm' to the construction industry, and transportation

and commerce, but also to the long-range revenue base of the Government," Senator HUMPHREY pointed out.

"Post office construction should be fitted into a priority of public-works projects," Senator HUMPHREY urged. "It is one of several ways that the Federal Government can move to check the growing recession."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in addition to a tax cut, and a sound program of public works, there are many other activities of the Federal Government whose direction should be changed. I am referring to the high-interest, tight-money policies of the Federal Reserve System, and of all the Federal agencies with loan programs. We need expanded direct credit programs—for farmers, for homebuyers, and for businessmen. And we need lower interest rates. These are critically needed, and it will not take special legislation to achieve them. The administration can, within the framework of existing law, loosen up the money situation and permit the wheels of the economy to roll smoother.

Mr. President, I have noted a number of very pertinent comments in the public press during the last few days dealing with the growing recession. They discuss not only public works and the tight-money situation, but they also discuss the role of an expanded trade program in restoring our economy to equilibrium.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 12 written by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, entitled "Facing the Recession."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACING THE RECESSION—IT SHOULD NOT BE TREATED AS AN INDELICATE SUBJECT
(By Roscoe Drummond)

The present recession is not something which will go away by pretending it doesn't exist. We ought not to treat it as an indelicate subject.

Conceivably the upturn is already in the making and will shortly be visible. But there is no guaranty that this is the case.

It confronts the Eisenhower administration with a hard and uncomfortable dilemma. The dilemma is: Whether to undertake a large public works program, initiate a tax cut and accept a sharply unbalanced budget, or to delay vigorous action in the hope that the recession will right itself without going into a long downward spiral of deflation.

My information is that the President is disposed to act vigorously the moment he believes it is needed. The issue is one of timing. With a man like Robert Anderson at the Treasury, backed by Presidential advisers Gabriel Hague and Raymond Saulnier, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, timidity is less likely to prevail than under Anderson's predecessor.

The stakes are high. There is, first of all, the human misery of large-scale unemployment. Secondly, for the United States to accept—and to accept unnecessarily—a serious depression in the present state of the world would have devastating repercussions. We would simply be giving the game to the Kremlin.

There is also a political stake. There is no doubt in my mind that if the administration falters or fumbles in dealing with the recession, it will be a long time before another Republican President is given the opportunity.

There are adverse elements in the current downturn which were not present in the mild recessions of 1949 and 1953-54. At this point unemployment is running about the same as before, but unlike the earlier recessions, the major sectors of the economy are nearly all ailing at the same time—consumer buying is down, inventories are still being reduced, capital expansion is sharply declining.

There is another adverse factor. In 1949 and 1954 Western Europe's economy was moving up when ours began to move down. This helped to arrest our own recession. Not so today. Economic difficulties in Western Europe are forcing a cut in the purchase of American exports.

On the encouraging side is the fact that housing activity is showing signs of rising, State and local governments are sustaining employment by major school and road construction and larger defense buying is beginning to flow.

I am not bespeaking a mood of gloom and doom. I am only saying that it is not sensible and it is not safe to take this recession lightly, for, as Elliott V. Bell, editor and publisher of Business Week magazine, pointed out in a recent talk to the Detroit Economic Club, once a spiral of deflation gets momentum, it is well nigh impossible to halt it.

It does seem to me that Mr. Bell makes sense when he says that since there are alternative risks, let's take the risk of doing more than is needed than the chance of being too little and too late.

There is no doubt that this is the most closely watched recession in American history. Mr. Eisenhower has lately created something near to a national economic council. Under his chairmanship its participants are Treasury Secretary Anderson, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Martin and Hauge and Saulnier.

There are good reasons to believe that Mr. Eisenhower will act boldly and energetically if the economy does not soon show signs of starting another period of growth. It would help, I believe, if the President made his intentions much more explicit than he has thus far.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the lead editorial of the Washington Post for February 12, 1958, entitled "To End Stagnation."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO END STAGNATION

The new figures on unemployment strongly suggest that the time has come for more drastic measures to reshape and reinvigorate the national productive effort. Conferences among top administration officials at the White House indicate that some such measures are being formulated. But if there is to be a genuine rebirth of confidence, without which the slump cannot be arrested, whatever program is being formulated must have some real substance. Mere restatements of the Presidential optimism, it is now plain, will not suffice.

At the same time, it needs to be kept constantly in mind that powerful forces of expansion are still present which, unrestrained, could again lead quickly to unacceptable inflation. The capacity to build homes, for example, and the need for more housing are as strong as ever and will grow stronger in the decade ahead. The same is true in many other fields. What is required is just enough new incentive to get the ball rolling; what is to be avoided is a slam-bang, crash program that would in a short time require severe new restraints to prevent a price run-away.

If a tax cut should become necessary to trigger a resumption of growth, most assuredly it should contain an automatic repeal provision. Federal spending needs to be increased by several billions annually if urgent defense and domestic needs are to be met. An increase in the 1959 budget goals would also have a considerable tonic effect on the economy. If, later on, it appeared that higher spending was having an inflationary effect, the budget could be restored to balance by a tax increase. For this year and perhaps for the next, however, a deficit would certainly be no cause for alarm.

As for monetary controls, the Federal Reserve Board ought to encourage further cuts in the rediscount rate at once. Very soon it should ease bank reserve requirements if the situation does not improve. These actions are easily reversible. The very fact that the financial community knows this—and knows that reversal would come swiftly if required—means that fairly vigorous actions to ease credit restraint are required to induce an actual credit expansion. The two cuts in the "Fed" rediscount rate made since the current recession began last fall have not been strong enough medicine.

An immediate and determined administration drive for long-term renewal of the Trade Agreements Act and for a real expansion of foreign economic development aid also would have a useful effect in restoring confidence. The slump in exports is serious and cannot be altogether offset by any foreseeable expansion of Government or private spending in this country. If the Nation does not act to insure a steadily growing market for its goods overseas, it will inevitably and critically stunt its economic growth. Significantly, those countries which in recent years have outstripped the rate of American economic growth have been nations which, like Germany, the Netherlands, and Japan, have been pushing foreign trade to the hilt.

Finally, a redefinition of American economic objectives probably would do more to promote expansion than any other single step. There is a growing feeling of unease that preoccupation with consumer spending leads to growth that requires some artificial—and therefore undependable—stimulants and props. There is a yearning for validity in the national economic effort, a yearning that we suspect will not be satisfied until there has been a substantial diversion of that effort to neglected fundamentals like research, education, and improved patterns of urban living.

Most of what needs to be done is not compatible with an 1890 view of free enterprise. But the same spirit which threw railroads across a continent and created the mightiest industrial plant on earth can serve today's needs too. It needs only a leadership and a direction that comprehend the radically changed nature of the challenges we now face. At bottom, the provision of that leadership is the real key which alone can unlock an economic future bright with promise.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in the New York Times of February 11, 1958, entitled "A Little Recession," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LITTLE RECESSION

Former President Truman, in a statement to the North American Newspaper Alliance published in this newspaper yesterday, expresses the opinion that the present slowdown of the American economy reflects a "lapse of confidence by our people in what we have been doing and where we are going." And he adds: "There are those who have been saying that a little recession is a good thing for the health of our economy. * * *

This kind of thinking is like believing a little bit of war might be beneficial."

Mr. Truman is particularly critical of our monetary policies, which he sees as "the most dangerous form of Government manipulation." There is nothing more damaging, he observes, "than the clamping down of sudden brakes on an expanding economy, which, without adequate preparation, is jolted again by a reversal of momentum."

We do not know anyone in the administration who has gone on record to the effect that a little recession is a good thing. We know many persons, in and out of the administration, who believe that a little recession is infinitely preferable to a major recession. And a temporary slow-down of the economy is one of the calculated risks that is always present when the authorities set out to head off runaway inflation—which is to say a serious and prolonged deterioration in the value of the Nation's currency.

It might be possible to make a case to show that the Federal Reserve authorities were slow in abandoning their easy money policy when they did, and that when they did adopt a restrictionist policy they pursued it too cautiously. But when the raising of the rediscount rate from 1½ to 3½ percent is carried out gradually over a period of more than 2½ years—or from early 1955 until late in 1957, it is a little difficult to conceive of it as clamping down of sudden brakes on an expanding economy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the February 11 edition of the New York Times written by Mr. Edwin L. Dale, Jr., entitled "Economists Doubt Fall Prosperity," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMISTS DOUBT FALL PROSPERITY—BUT PANEL OF FIVE TELLS CONGRESS THE NATION MAY THEN BE IN A RECOVERY PHASE

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, February 10.—A panel of five economists was unanimous today in the opinion that the Nation would not return to a state of prosperity by November unless the Government took further antirecession action.

The economists testified before the Joint Congressional Economic Committee. Several said they felt the downward movement would be over by late fall or before that time, even without Government action. But they did not foresee a pickup that would return the Nation to prosperity.

DOUGLAS ASKS TAX CUT

The economists had been asked whether they agreed that by election we'll have prosperity. Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, attributed that view to the Secretary of Commerce, Sinclair Weeks, on the basis of remarks by Mr. Weeks on a television program yesterday.

The group generally agreed that the Government must be ready to move in case the situation grew worse, though they disagreed on what should be done.

One indicated a preference for more defense spending, 1 for more domestic spending, and 2 for a tax cut. The fifth did not propose any remedies but stressed the importance of lower trade barriers.

Meanwhile, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS became the first member of the Joint Committee to advocate an antirecession tax cut. In a Senate speech the Illinois Democrat, an economist in private life, said "the time to act has arrived." He based his view mainly on the rise in unemployment.

He urged that the rate on the first \$1,000 of taxable income be reduced from the present 20 percent to 15 percent, with a resulting

tax cut of a maximum of \$50 a person. He also asked for reduction or elimination in a wide variety of consumer taxes. The total cost of his proposal would be \$4,400,000,000 in revenues, of which \$3 billion would result from the income-tax cut.

In another development President Eisenhower conferred again with his special economic advisory group. Its members are Robert B. Anderson, the Secretary of the Treasury; William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board; Raymond J. Saulnier, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, and Gabriel Hauge, White House economic assistant. As usual, no announcement was made after the meeting.

DATA ON PROJECTS ASKED

Also today Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat of Texas and chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, announced he had requested a special report on Federal public works projects that might be started quickly if needed. The request was sent to Maj. Gen. John S. Bragdon, the President's special public works assistant.

Today's comments by the five economists came at hearings on the President's economic message.

John Kenneth Galbraith of Harvard University urged a further substantial easing of monetary policy, an increase in unemployment compensation and an increase in spending for domestic programs.

He opposed a tax cut as hard to reverse and said it might not produce so quick an effect as higher spending. He said "we now have many things that need doing," in the fields of education, research, health, rental housing, urban redevelopment, and resource development.

ASKS DEFENSE INCREASE

Lester V. Chandler of Princeton University said that without Government action "the decline may well continue through the end of the year." He recommended "an immediate and rapid increase" in defense spending. He also opposed a tax cut.

Ralph J. Watkins of the Brookings Institution saw "a good prospect that recovery will be underway before another 6 to 7 months have gone by."

However, he urged that plans be made for a tax cut if needed and for "a prompt request to the Congress for repeal of the debt ceiling."

Yale Brozen of the University of Chicago argued that a lowering of United States trade barriers would help stimulate exports and therefore help industries that have suffered most.

Roy Blough of Columbia University said the "present recession should be taken more seriously" than those of 1949 and 1953. He said the "outlook for major expansion to be initiated in the near future in the private sector seems rather dim."

He called for a "temporary reduction of individual income taxes" if the economy "declines much further or if there has been no considerable upturn by the time Congress approaches adjournment."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, each of these thoughtful and incisive editorials and reports deserves the study of my colleagues. They express the growing concern among informed and intelligent Americans not only that we are moving headlong into economic difficulties, but that the Administration is not grasping the many opportunities available for checking this slip into the economic pit.

RIISING BANK PROFITS

Mr. President, we are now witnessing the results of the administration's fiscal and monetary policies. Unemployment

is mounting, industrial production is dropping, retail sales are declining and business failures are at an 18-year high. For many, many months, Mr. President, I have spoken out on the inherent danger to our economy in the economic policies and programs of the administration. I have in particular called attention to the fallacies of the tight-money program which has sent interest rates to 25-year highs and hampered economic growth.

I wish to call attention to the fact, however, that the administration's tight-money policies have proved beneficial to at least one group, namely the investment and commercial banks. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System recently announced that the earnings of member banks for 1957 were the highest in history. Bank profits after taxes last year amounted to \$1,169 million—an increase of 14 percent over 1956. While bank profits last year rose by 14 percent, per capita personal income after taxes rose only 2.5 percent. In the past 5 years while bank profits after taxes climbed 41 percent, per capita personal income increased 16 percent.

As I have said many times, the Republican Party takes care of its friends. Tight money might not help consumers, farmers, small-business men, and wage earners, but it has proven a bonanza for the bankers.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a table showing net profits of member banks from 1952 through 1957.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Profits after taxes of Federal Reserve member banks

[In millions]	
1952.....	\$829
1953.....	865
1954.....	1,096
1955.....	985
1956.....	1,027
1957.....	1,169

Source: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

SUBSIDIZING CONSUMERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if as much space were given in the city press and national periodicals about how American farmers are subsidizing consumers as is devoted to attacks on supposed subsidies to farmers, there would be far less misunderstanding about the need for a strong agriculture.

If farm commodity prices had gone up at the same rate as other cost-of-living items since the Korean war, food and clothing would now be about 15 percent higher. Food and clothing during the 1951-57 period would have cost consumers many billions more than consumers actually paid. For consumers and taxpayers, other than farmers, this has been a fabulous bargain.

Farmers, in effect, have been, and still are, subsidizing consumers of America. They are taking the losses, so consumers can have a bargain. Food absorbs a smaller proportion of the consumer's

spendable dollar than anywhere else in the world.

In view of these facts, it appears rather ungrateful for city residents and consumers to object to efforts toward seeking some economic justice for the producers making such food bargains possible. Of course, it is not the consumers who are to blame. They are not getting the real story; they are continually being given a distorted version.

We need to see that consumers get the real facts. Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, very effectively pointed this out in an editorial entitled "No Time To Lose" published in the February issue of the National Grange Monthly. Every city Senator and Representative should read this editorial.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have portions of the editorial referred to printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the portions of the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO TIME TO LOSE

We in agriculture need to give more thought and attention to our reputation. What other people think of us is mighty important, and what many city people are thinking about us is downright alarming.

Today 150 million people live in small towns and big cities, but only 21 million live on farms. Farmers are a steadily diminishing minority, both in actual numbers and percentage of the total population.

In a democracy what the majority thinks is, sometimes, even more important than the facts. City people form their opinion about farming and farmers on what they hear and read. Few of them have little direct contact with farmers.

Industry and labor spend billions of dollars a year to influence public opinion. Their annual budget for public relations, advertising, and promotion exceeds the net income of all farmers combined. I doubt that agriculture spends as much as \$100,000 a year for that purpose.

BIGGEST BARGAIN

We've got a selling job to do, and that includes a great deal more than persuading consumers to buy more of our good products. We need to convince them that food and clothing are their biggest bargains today.

City consumers hear a lot about high food prices, and many of them, if not most, think what they hear is true. They are told that Government programs which restrict production and support prices are responsible. They read and hear that they must pay 2 prices for their food—1 at the grocery store and "another through taxes to support a \$5 billion a year subsidy to farmers."

I don't blame them for believing as they do. We have done too little to provide them with the facts. We can never earn their friendship and understanding just with a hard-luck story. That would be the wrong way to go about it. We do have more than our share of troubles, income-wise, but we have no monopoly on troubles.

Possibly most food consumers are not greatly interested in our troubles, but the vast majority of them are fair-minded individuals when they know the facts. What they have been getting are half-truths and distortions. Some of the facts are:

Food is the biggest bargain in America today.

Retail food prices average only 1 percent above 1951.

Prices received by farmers have gone down 20 percent since 1951.

Farmers' operating costs have gone up 15 percent since 1951.

Weekly factory wage rates have gone up 23 percent since 1951.

Per capita farm income is about half the urban rate—even with reasonable allowances for farm produced and consumed items to make the figures really meaningful.

The plain facts of the matter are that food absorbs—in this country—a smaller proportion of the consumer's spendable dollar than anywhere else in the world. Eight minutes of labor will buy a quart of milk. In France it requires 16 minutes, and in Russia 42 minutes.

If farm commodity prices had gone up at the same rate as other cost-of-living items since the Korean war, food and clothing would now be about 15 percent higher. Food and clothing during the 1951-57 period would have cost consumers many billions more than they actually paid. For consumers and taxpayers—other than farmers—this has been a fabulous bargain.

Farmers, in short, have been—and are—subsidizing the consumers of America.

The story of today's food bargain is one that we need to tell over and over. Much of the current resentment against farmers is based on the false assumption that food prices are high and that farmers are reaping the benefits. This is the challenge agriculture, and in fact the entire food industry, faces today.

It would seem, then, that if we are to make income progress for agriculture, it is time to acquaint consumers with the fact that today's food bargain is a result of inadequate income for the producers of food.

NEED FOR PRODUCTION RESEARCH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a convincing case for continued support of agricultural production research, at a time when many will be clamoring to cut back such activities, is contained in an editorial appearing in the January issue of the Farmer, published in St. Paul, Minn., and serving 260,000 subscribers in the Midwest.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I am impressed by this effective presentation. I urge that it be carefully read by my colleagues on the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Let's Not Skimp on Production Research," be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S NOT SKIMP ON PRODUCTION RESEARCH

Something you ate today was on your table because a scientist in a laboratory or in a field somewhere 10, 15, or 20 years ago made a discovery. Something you grew last season * * * Hard Red Spring wheat, for example * * * came through the summer and produced a reasonable yield because of efforts of a plant breeder in St. Paul or Fargo or Brookings or somewhere else a dozen or more years ago.

Reflect on this basic fact as this session of the Congress gets underway. During the coming months you will be reading excerpts from persuasive speeches on the floor of the House and Senate. These will come from the lips of men and women representing agricultural States as well as States with very large urban populations. They will argue that since so much money is needed for missile development, and development of other defense tools, there must be a cut

in Government costs, and what more logical area, they will argue, than in research aimed at increasing agricultural production.

"Why keep these scientists at work producing better wheat varieties when we've got wheat enough for the next 2 years?" The same argument will be applied to corn and cotton, to increasing production from our milk cows, to the production of more pork and beef, to development of better grasses and legumes, and to research aimed at protecting our crops and our herds and flocks against diseases and parasites. And there will be a vast majority of America's urban population who will agree. And some farmers, too.

Forseeing these efforts to withdraw funds from production research has been a matter of deep concern lately to many thoughtful persons. One of them, S. L. Nevins, vice president of Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., and a member of the national committee on boys and girls club work, speaking in Chicago recently, declared: "I am certain that agriculture is the next area in which we will be challenged by the Russians. And if Russia ever beats us in the cornfield, we'll be poor indeed. We will have lost our most significant race."

There is reason for Mr. Nevins' prediction. Russia is graduating two and a half times more agricultural students than are now being graduated from American universities, despite the fact it has only half as many enrolled in colleges and universities. This stepped-up emphasis on agricultural science is comparatively new to Russia. The number of agricultural students being graduated from Russian universities was stepped up 80 percent in the years between 1948, when that country started its all-out strength-building program, through 1954. During the same period there was a decline of 30 percent in the number of agricultural students being graduated from United States colleges.

Looking from another angle at this picture of deemphasizing production research on the one hand, and on the other emphasizing the so-called pure sciences, such as chemistry and physics, Dr. Theodore C. Byerly, Deputy Administrator of Research in USDA, told us while we were in his office a while back: "Government budgetmakers don't even regard the natural scientist as a scientist anymore. If he is thought about at all, it is with contempt or accusation * * * contempt for the work he has done, accusation that he has already done too much."

The legislator who argues that we have so far outdistanced potential enemies in food production that they will be a long time catching up, so we can afford to drop a large part of production research program for awhile, overlooks the constant danger to our crops. Certainly he overlooked a most dramatic example in the past year. That was the invasion of white leaf (Hoja Blanca disease) of rice found in a field near Belle Glade, Fla., last August. It threatens our \$200 million rice crop. But because plant breeders have pulled out of our world collection of 4,000 strains and varieties of rice, 289 that are resistant to the disease, there isn't much worry. There'll be one or a dozen that can be combined with our good varieties to make new kinds of the quality and with the capacity for yield which rice growers need.

We don't need to think of a crop as unimportant as rice is to us in the upper Midwest to find an example of the importance of production research. The wheat we mentioned at the outset of this editorial is as good an example. We would point out to the legislator arguing against funds for production research that had it not been for Thatcher Hard Red Spring wheat that replaced Ceres in 1935, and Mida, Rival, and Pilot that replaced Thatcher in about 1940, and Selkirk that replaced wheats susceptible to rust race 15B in the early 1950's, there would

not be a sufficient supply of good bread wheat at the moment. And certainly we'd not be making friends at home and abroad with our fine durum had it not been for having had varieties ready to replace those susceptible to rust. We believe it is better to have a surplus of these wheats than to be worried about a shortage.

Just consider what a terrible blow it would be to our livestock industry, and therefore to all of our citizenry, if it became impossible to grow alfalfa. Alfalfa was threatened by the alfalfa aphid. First discovered in California in 1954, it spread across 31 States and caused \$80 million damage in the following 3 years. And the stem nematode of alfalfa, now a plague of the Southwest may one day reach us. But there is a strong line of defense against these threats to alfalfa. It just happened that some money appropriated for alfalfa research was earmarked for use by Dr. Oliver Smith, a USDA plant breeder working at the University of Nevada experiment station. He observed plants from crosses he had made are resistant to both the aphid and the nematode. Unfortunately, the varieties are not winter-hardy enough to grow here, but the resistant characteristic is being combined with the winter-hardy and other characteristics of our better varieties to tailor-make one for our climate.

When and if your city friends complain about the use of tax money for agricultural production research, you might counter their argument with examples already given in this editorial, and with others, that they are getting more for their dollar in production research than anywhere else that government spends and/or invests tax dollars. One most excellent example is how well investment in research on poultry nutrition has paid off. (Much better for the urban dweller just now than for the farmer.) But suggest that your friend consider this: A few years ago a broiler consumed about 4½ pounds of feed to make a pound of gain. Now broilers are being produced at a feed conversion rate of 2.4 pounds and down to 2 pounds of feed per pound of gain, and so ready-to-cook broilers can be bought for 40 cents or less a pound in the retail meat market now while a few years ago, when the food dollar was much more valuable, they cost 65 cents a pound or more. Discussing this, Dr. Ervin L. Peterson, Under Secretary of Agriculture, recently reminisced: "In 1925 I worked in a Los Angeles poultry market. I remember selling live, tough old tom turkeys for 65 cents a pound, live old hens for 65 cents a pound as a Saturday special, and live broilers that a woman had to take home and pick, gut, and dress for 45 cents a pound."

And Dr. Byerly, to whom we previously referred, doesn't think that scientists have made the feed conversion rate down as far as is possible. "Just think," he says. "When you are putting feed containing 90 percent dry matter into a broiler containing 25 percent dry matter, the feed conversion rate isn't 2 pounds per pound of gain. In terms of dry matter it figures out to be 7.2 pounds of feed per pound of gain, and that leaves the scientists with quite a challenge on their hands."

It is altogether likely that some scientist working somewhere at the moment you read this is on the threshold of a discovery that in peace or war will be of immense value. We cannot afford to take chances by cutting down on the appropriations he and his colleagues need to carry on their work.

FACILITATION OF TRAVEL AND COMMUNICATION BETWEEN MINNESOTA AND CANADIAN PROVINCES OF ONTARIO AND MANITOBA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most engaging and interesting in-

ternational relationships exists along the northern border of our country with our good friend and neighbor to the north, Canada. My own State of Minnesota borders on the Canadian Provinces of Ontario and Manitoba, and quietly, year in and year out, efforts are made by both Americans and Canadians to facilitate travel and communication back and forth between our two countries. Currently our Minnesotans are engaged in a friendly discussion and effort with the Manitobians to develop a port of entry at Caribou, Minn.

The reasons for this effort are set forth very clearly in a letter which I recently received from the president of the Greenbush Association of Commerce, Mr. Don Wicklund.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have printed at this point in the Record the letter from Mr. Wicklund, dated January 27, 1958.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Greenbush, Minn., January 27, 1958.
Re port of entry, Caribou, Kittson County,
Minn.
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: We, the Association of Commerce, Greenbush, Minn., at the request of and in behalf of the other civic organizations of our community, and the people located here, respectfully urge that a port of entry be established at Caribou, Minn. We feel that this port of entry should first be started on a trial or test basis and that this test should commence about May 1, 1958. We hereby submit our reasons for thinking that a port of entry should be established as above explained.

There is a continual and definite demand for the establishment of this port of entry by the peoples in our area. A copy of a petition as held in our files, and herewith attached, at least shows the interest taken by some 200 individuals of our community as it pertains to this Caribou port. The towns and communities to the south of us, including Strathcona, Middle River, Holt, and Thief River Falls, are likewise vitally concerned and are urging the establishment of this port of entry. Our Canadian neighbors to the north of us have for many years worked for the establishment of this port. This was especially demonstrated to us on August 17, 1957, when the Honorable Premier Douglas Campbell, of Manitoba, made a special trip to Greenbush, Minn., for the purpose of eliminating obstacles so that a port of entry could be established at an early date at Caribou.

A borderline survey indicates that there is a greater distance between ports in our area than in any other area in this district.

The obstacle of an inadequate road on the Canadian side from the border toward Vita has now been eliminated by the recent construction of a gravel-surfaced highway; further road improvement is anticipated on both sides of the border if a port is established. Roseau County officials have informed us that the construction of a black top highway from Greenbush, north, toward Caribou for a distance of, at least, 8 miles is in the calendar for 1958. The long-term goal is that Minnesota State Highway No. 32, which now ends at Greenbush, will be extended up to Caribou, Minn., where it would link with the Canadian Highway No. 32 from the border to Vita, Manitoba, and thence to Canadian Highway No. 12, 12 miles north of Vita and thence to Winnipeg.

The tourist business is fast becoming an important part of our economy and shows promise of being more so. The natural tourist attractions on both sides of the border, such as lakes, Roseau River Refuge, etc. will be greatly improved by the establishment of this port.

We also believe that a port of entry at Caribou, Minn.-Arbakka, Man., would greatly help to perpetuate the friendly relations which now exist between the United States and Canada. It is a matter of record from past history, that Canada has at times, in cooperation with the United States, established customs and immigration facilities where the stronger desire for the port of entry was from the United States side of the boundary.

Now the Canadians, themselves, have initiated the drive to establish a port of entry in the Caribou-Arbakka area; they have proved their good intentions by the construction of the new highway to the border; they have labored long and hard to impress their own government with their needs; they have made numerous visits to this area to encourage our cooperation and to prod us into action when we have lagged. The establish of the port should be regarded as a move of cooperation with these friendly neighbors and would in effect be a maintenance of good foreign relations which is of such great importance today.

We know that you are well acquainted with existing conditions in our area, which has been somewhat retarded the latter years by adverse weather and crop conditions, but which has, in the past and will again in the future, be regarded as a prosperous agricultural area supporting active towns such as Vita, Stuartberg, Steinbeck, etc.

We again respectfully urge that our application for a port of entry at Caribou, Minn., be presented to the Bureau of Customs and that full support and all possible effort and consideration be given the matter.

Very truly yours,

GREENBUSH ASSOCIATION OF

COMMERCE.

DON WICKLUND, *President.*

C. G. CARTWRIGHT, *Secretary.*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have asked the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Customs Service to study this proposal and to give me a report as to its feasibility. In the meantime, I wish my colleagues to know that an exchange of ideas and cooperation is proceeding very fruitfully indeed along our northern borders.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

INVESTIGATION OF ACTIVITIES OF REGULATORY BODIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to say most respectfully to my friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], that I wish to commend him for his courageous efforts in seeking to have the regulatory bodies of Government, which are the creatures of the Congress of the United States, periodically examined and placed under the watchful eye of Congressional scrutiny.

These executive agencies, Mr. President, are independent agencies. They depend for their continuity upon Congressional enactment. They therefore have a particular responsibility to the Congress, as the Congress has to them.

I am happy to notify the Senate and the other body, Mr. President, that on November 28, 1955, I directed a letter to

the Senate Committee on Government Operations, addressed to the staff director, Mr. Walter Reynolds, and asked that a study be made of the activities and procedures of five regulatory agencies; the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I am happy to report, Mr. President, that in response to such request of the staff, the Comptroller General assigned a member of the Comptroller General's staff, one Mr. Arch Brown, to assist in the development of information relating to the delays and irregularities that were allegedly existing at that time in the agencies which I mentioned.

Mr. President, those reports were turned over to the so-called Moulder subcommittee. They are in the possession both of the Senate Committee on Government Operations and the Office of the Comptroller General, as well as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the other body.

I wish to say to whatever committee may be established in the Senate, or whatever work may be done by the Committee on Government Operations, that a substantial body of evidence is in our possession already. In fact, much of the work which was done in the House subcommittee was the result of the preparatory investigations or the preliminary investigations made by the staff of the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

I wish to add, Mr. President, that the only reason why this inquiry was not carried further was that the field had been preempted, so to speak, by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The former counsel of that committee, one Mr. Bernard Schwartz, whose name has been most prominently mentioned in recent days, received these reports as preliminary guidelines for his investigative activities.

I invite the attention of Senators, Mr. President, in this regard, to pages 65 to 67 of Senate Report No. 1 of the 85th Congress, which sets forth the details concerning the staff study and points out that the committee discontinued its studies at the request of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I hope that the Senate will make it its business to go into whatever inquiry the situation may require, methodically, carefully, and with painstaking effort. I associate myself with that endeavor.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). At the request of the Vice President, the Chair announces the appointment by the Vice President of the following members on the part of the Senate to the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy: The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT AND ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "A REVIEW OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY AND OPERATIONS," SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ELLENDER TO APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, JANUARY 24, 1958

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate a resolution which I submit at this time, in behalf of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 260) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document the report entitled "A Review of United States Foreign Policy and Operations," submitted by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on January 24, 1958; and that 3,000 additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. The senior Senator from Louisiana made a very extensive tour throughout the world, and his report was printed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, of which I am chairman.

There has been a great demand for the report. The Senator submitted a resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which I am also a member, providing for the printing of 7,500 additional copies. However, upon examination of the cost of printing, it was discovered that the printing could not be taken care of through a Senate resolution. It would require a concurrent resolution.

I have, therefore, reduced the number to 3,000 copies, which could be printed under the limitation of \$1,200 as provided by law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 266) requesting the return of the enrollment of H. R. 8038 by the President to the House of Representatives for the purposes of reenrollment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1040. An act to amend the acts known as the Life Insurance Act approved June 19, 1934, and the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940; and

S. 2920. An act to provide for small-business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall.

PUBLIC WORKS AND THE RECESSION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, when I read the newspapers yesterday morning and saw the headlines to the effect that a \$2 billion program had been announced by the President for the purpose of stemming the recession, I had the feeling that the executive branch of the Government was about to take positive steps immediately to turn back the recession from which the country has been suffering.

THERE IS NO \$2 BILLION PROGRAM PLANNED

I was amazed, however, upon learning the details of the statement made at the White House, and the description made therein, to find that there was really no basis whatsoever for the implication which was made by the announcement of the \$2 billion program. It is not a \$2 billion program at all. It is a \$175 million program, and is based wholly upon the willingness of Congress to pass new legislation, amending the suggestion which has already come from the Post Office Department, with the blessing of the President, to increase the postage rate on first class mail to 5 cents outside local communities, and to increase the rate to 4 cents for local mail.

Of the \$2 billion mentioned in the press yesterday morning, \$1½ billion is wholly dependent upon the so-called pay and purchase program, and it would take probably 5 years to carry out that program.

SUGGESTED PROGRAM IS BASED ON PRIVATE INVESTMENT

In order to make clear precisely what is meant by the so-called \$2 billion program, I think I should read into the RECORD portions of the release from the White House dated February 11, for which credit is claimed by Mr. James C. Hagerty, press secretary to the President:

The President today directed Postmaster Summerfield to present promptly to Congress a \$2 billion program to modernize the obsolete physical plant of the Post Office Department over the next 3 to 5 years.

This is not a proposal for immediate action, Mr. President. That should be made clear. I continue:

The program will involve rehabilitating, enlarging, or replacing 2,500 Government-owned post office buildings, replacing or remodeling 12,000 leased buildings, and providing modern mail-handling equipment for all postal facilities.

Under the new program developed by the Postmaster General, the funds from private investors for construction of new post offices to be occupied under lease would approximate \$1,500,000.

RECESSION STEMS FROM HOLD-BACKS IN PRIVATE INVESTMENT

Mr. President, one of the causes of the recession from which we are suffering is the failure of the owners of capital to invest. They have been holding back from investment. I know of no testimony which has been presented as yet which indicates that there is any real

possibility that investment in the degree of \$1,500 million may be expected to carry out the proposal to fight the current recession.

THE RECESSION IS HERE NOW

This is a current recession. The budget was prepared last November and December. It is very difficult for the Bureau of the Budget to prepare the document because it must look forward for some 18 months, at least, to determine what the receipts of the Government will be and what the expenditures are likely to be.

ADVANCE WARNINGS OF RECESSION WERE IGNORED

The sad fact is that when the budget was being prepared, any person, either in public life or out of public life, who even hinted that the reductions in the expenditures of the Government for national defense were themselves helping to produce unemployment was called a prophet of doom and of gloom. Those who wished to issue a warning that economic things were not going along all right were urged not to open their mouths; they were told that to make such statements would be to undermine public confidence.

Mr. President, I think all of us must agree that if the signs of an economic downturn are apparent, they ought to be made clear, both to the public and, particularly, to those who are in charge of the activities of the Government. Certainly they should be made known to the Members of Congress, who are called upon to pass the legislation which may be necessary.

JANUARY PREDICTIONS OF INCOME INCREASE WERE UNWARRANTED

The budget which was submitted to the Congress in January actually predicted that in 1959, personal incomes would be \$9 billion larger than they were in the previous year. In the President's budget message it was stated that instead of the \$343 billion total of personal incomes in 1958, the personal incomes of the people of the United States in 1959 would be \$352 billion. I hope I have stated the figures correctly. If not, I shall see that they are corrected from the documents in the record.

That was a prediction that there would be a \$9 billion increase in personal income. But at the same time, and in the same document, it was predicted that corporate incomes would remain stationary, at approximately \$40 billion. When Mr. Anderson, the Secretary of the Treasury, appeared before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I directed his attention to that statement in the budget message; and I asked him for an explanation of how it was possible to expect personal incomes to increase by \$9 billion when there would be no increase at all in corporate incomes.

CABINET CHANGED TUNE ABOUT A MARCH UPTURN

All of us know that a very large segment of employment is by the great corporations. We know that unemployment is increasing. At the time when the budget was being prepared for presentation to the Congress, members of the President's Cabinet were saying there

would be an upturn in March. But when we held the hearings before the Joint Economic Committee and when we asked those members of the Cabinet—the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Treasury Department, and other branches of the Government—to state their views about unemployment, they no longer held to the prediction that the upturn would come in March. Instead, they predicted that it would not come until much later.

LEADING ECONOMISTS DO NOT BELIEVE UPTURN WILL COME SO SOON

The last hearing of the Joint Economic Committee was held on last Monday. At that time five economists testified. They were not chosen by hand, to represent a particular doctrine; instead, they were chosen because throughout the country they are recognized as being men of ability, patriotism, and keen understanding of the economics of the Nation. Not one of those men looked for any improvement by March. All of them agreed that the upturn could not come speedily.

When I selected from Barron's Weekly of February 10, last Monday, a brief quotation, which I read into the RECORD, quoting the views of the Chase Manhattan Bank—certainly not a prophet of doom and of gloom, but one of the largest banks in the world, and one which should know something about the economic situation—and when in that way I showed to them the position taken by the Chase Manhattan Bank, namely, that the crux of this recession would not come until 1959, not one of those gentlemen challenged that statement.

OTHERS DO NOT SHARE THE PRESIDENT'S OPTIMISM

Mr. President, imagine my surprise when I found the President quoted as saying that he expects the upturn to come next month, in March.

Unemployment has been increasing; and men of unassailable ability have testified that the unemployment will reach 5 million.

The committee could call before it any witnesses, without regard to partisanship. None of the witnesses who appeared before the committee wore the rosy glasses which have been presented to the President, for him to use in looking at the situation which now exists in the Nation's economy.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was present at the hearings. I remember his presence in the joint committee, when it heard the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Anderson—a very able and capable man, who has reversed the policy of the preceding Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey. Even Mr. Anderson said—in response to my question—that he expected that things would grow worse before they grew better.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What the Senator from Wyoming has just said reminds me

of the fact that, according to the press and radio reports, the Secretary of Commerce last night made a speech in the course of which he condemned the brigade of gloom and doom forecasters among the Democrats. However, is it not true that the Secretary of Commerce himself, in announcing the unemployment figures last month, predicted that the unemployment figures for next month would be even larger?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course he did.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yet when any of us dare say something about that, we are said to be prophets of gloom and doom, according to the terminology used by those to whom I have just referred. Is not that true?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely; that is exactly what the situation is.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a further question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the Senator from Wyoming read carefully the President's presentation, on yesterday, of economic facts of life, and his predictions, and so forth. Did the Senator from Wyoming find in the President's pronouncement a new thought or a new program? Was not it simply a recapitulation of his budget message and his economic message, with the sole exception of the reference he made to a proposed post-office building program?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; the only new proposal was the suggestion of a change in the use of the funds proposed to be derived by increasing the price of postage stamps.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, by increasing the price of the postage stamps which must be placed on the mail which the mass of the people send or receive.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Just before the Senator came to the floor, I was reading a press statement that came from the White House, under date of February 11, and credited to Mr. James C. Hagerty, to show the facts as he presents them belie the impression that was carried in the headlines, of a \$2 billion program to fight the recession. So I attempted to prove, by what Mr. Hagerty says, that this is a program without substance, and not calculated to have any beneficial effect upon the recession from which the country is suffering.

Let me read this from Mr. Hagerty's statement. He said first, so that the context may be clear, that of the \$2 billion, \$1½ billion would come from private investment. We all know that private investment is one of the categories that has been going down, and one of the reasons why we have a recession.

Mr. Hagerty states:

The capital investment to be made by the Government is estimated at \$175 million a year for the period of the program.

And the program, of course, is for the next 3 to 5 years. The trouble is now, not 3 to 5 years from now.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator know or does he have a good idea as to

whether or not plans are ready on a single one of those buildings?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no idea. I know the President speaks of taking them off the shelf. Before I get through, I shall point out how the Bureau of the Budget has required the Department of the Interior to put on the shelf public works projects for which Congress has appropriated and authorized all the money needed for the present.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Are they not still on the shelf?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They are still on the shelf, and I am hoping they will be taken off the shelf.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Those projects are ready to go now, are they not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. One of them was actually going.

I say to the Senator that, for example, the appropriation bill which Congress passed last year for public works provided \$1½ million for the building of the Navaho Dam in the State of New Mexico for the benefit of the Indians.

That money was to have been expended during the fiscal year 1958, of which 7½ months are now behind us. Not a penny of that \$1½ million has been expended for Navaho. Because some of us representing Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah complained about the action of the Bureau of the Budget compelling the Department of the Interior to cut back, that \$1½ million has been switched from the Navaho project in New Mexico to the Flaming Gorge project in Utah and Wyoming.

As one of the Senators representing the State of Wyoming, I say the public officials of my State do not want to take that money away from Navaho. The Navaho project ought to be worked on immediately.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the Senator from Wyoming could multiply instances of that kind many times over, examples of projects that have been placed on the shelf, and that could easily be taken off the shelf and used to put people to work.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The program announced by the administration is that there shall be no new starts in the construction of reservoirs to store water. Next Monday, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I shall open a hearing in the Senate Office Building to review the work which has been done behind the Iron Curtain to conserve the waters of Soviet Russia, both in Europe and in Siberia. I shall point out the expenditures that were made behind the Iron Curtain, under the instruction and guidance of American engineers, sometimes by big American corporations like the General Electric Co., which sent its men to those countries to do the work on building some Russian reservoirs. We shall show how the waters of Russia and Siberia are being conserved, while the policy of this administration is no new starts.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, he may recall that about 2 weeks ago, or perhaps a little less, I delivered a talk here on the

Senate floor in which I discussed the housing program in the light of the President's economic report and budget message, and also some of the potentials of home building to help pull up the sagging economy.

If the Senator noticed, in the President's statement of yesterday he referred to housing as his first program. May I say to the Senator I read the statement carefully, and there is not one single new proposal in the statement. There is nothing in it to challenge the sagging economy of this country or to give even a psychological lift in the fight against the present recession.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator how that housing program began?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator mean how it began years ago?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. I referred to the liberalization provisions of August 1957.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The White House told of the few things that had been done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How did that program begin? Who took the initiative?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We in the Congress have been prodding for action. Last year we passed a better housing program than the administration would endorse. We passed it over the administration's opposition.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me make my question specific. Who passed the provision for a sharply liberalized schedule of minimum required downpayments?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Congress passed it last year, over the opposition of the administration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me read the paragraph I have before me, because someone is fooling the President, and I resent it. I do not believe the President of the United States should be put in the position of claiming for himself acts that were taken by Congress. Let me read. This is very, very cleverly written. The hand of Madison Avenue guides the pen in the White House.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, we all know this administration has the cleverest writers of any administration in history.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is why I say the mind of Madison Avenue guides the hand holding the pen in the White House.

I shall now quote from the Fact Paper on Certain Programs and Proposals Bearing on the Current Economic Situation, issued from the White House at the same time the President made his statement on the economic situation:

The Federal Government has taken a number of steps, going back over a period of months, to help promote an increase in home construction.

In August 1957, a sharply liberalized schedule of minimum required downpayments was put into effect for FHA-insured home loans. On a \$12,000 house, for example, the minimum required downpayment was reduced from \$1,200 to \$600.

Not a word was said about the action of Congress.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is right. A little further on in the statement he laments the fact that Congress

did not do all he asked it to do, the principal point being to raise interest rates. Is it not a little contradictory that right at this time he should make such a statement, when interest rates are coming down? As a matter of fact, if he did not make reference to it in this message, at other times he has talked about the credit charge. That is another way of saying interest rates.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let us get this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the same spot, so that everybody who reads the RECORD may understand what is going on by way of publicity. It is important that the people should know how they are being deceived by publicity statements.

In the first set of indented paragraphs of things that have been done "to help promote an increase in home construction" there is not a word about any participation by Congress, which leaves the impression in the mind of any reader who does not know better that these things were all done by the Executive—whereas they were not. They could not have been done by the Executive if Congress had not acted.

Then we come to the new set of steps to be taken, and it opens this way:

Prompt action by the Congress on several matters already before it would help to promote a higher level of home construction.

There is the assumption now that if it were not for the Congress something would be done.

The Congress should act promptly on the request of the Federal Housing Administration for a supplemental authorization which would permit FHA to accelerate the processing of home loan insurance applications.

The interest rate limitation on GI home loans should be eliminated, to permit veterans of World War II to enjoy their benefits under this program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I interpolate? That means the interest rates should be raised.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would have been very accurate and very illustrative of the fact if the author of this press release had added there, "The policy of Secretary Humphrey has been abandoned."

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I say that it could have been greatly shortened if they had simply stated, "Congress ought to raise interest rates on loans to GIs"? That is what it means, but they used the language the Senator has quoted.

Will the Senator look at that language again, to see how far around they went without mentioning interest rates? That is what the statement means. It means interest rates should have been raised on loans to GIs.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I assume the Senator knows that an increase of 1 percent in the interest rate that the veteran has to pay for one of these long-term mortgages represents an increase of 10 percent in his monthly payment and an increase of 10 percent in the final cost of the house to the veteran. If the Presi-

dent really wants to help those veterans, might I suggest that he should use his influence to bring interest rates down, because I am convinced that the administration has used its influence to get them up where they are.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that the paper from which I am reading was not written for the purpose of persuading Congress to do anything. This paper was written for the sole purpose of convincing the writers of headlines in the newspapers that the administration has made a complete turnabout in its policy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the Senator is absolutely right. Did the Senator notice what the Wall Street reaction was after this message went out?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I heard about it on a television program last night.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Those who are on Wall Street apparently saw through it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Well, somebody ought to see through it. Somebody certainly ought to see through it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I interpolate one other thought in connection with what the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] said?

I am speaking now from memory, but I think my memory is correct when I state that increasing the interest rate 1 percent over the time for the payment of the mortgage has the effect of increasing the amount which the person has to pay by \$6.50 per thousand per year. In other words, on a 10-year mortgage that would represent approximately \$6 a month of additional payment that the veteran would have to make. For some of these fellows who buy houses with \$10,000 mortgages—which is about the cheapest house one can buy today—the \$6 per month additional payment is quite an item. In effect, that is about what is being stated in the circumlocution which the Senator from Wyoming read to us.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will yield further, an increase of an interest rate on a housing mortgage works out to a higher percentage of increase on the payment, depending upon the period of the mortgage.

For example, on a 25-year mortgage, an increase of 1 percent in the interest rate will work out to an increase of somewhat more than 10 percent on the monthly payment and the total cost. If we talk about a 30-year mortgage, the increase of 1 percent in the interest rate works out to more than a 10-percent increase in the payments and total cost.

I believe most veterans' mortgages, Mr. President, are about 25-year mortgages. If the veterans want to know what Mr. Eisenhower is asking Congress to help the veteran do, it is to add 10 percent to whatever monthly payment is involved. If it is a \$60 monthly payment, the President is urging us to help the veteran pay \$66. If it is a \$70 monthly payment, the President is urging us to help the veteran pay \$77. If it is a \$100

monthly payment, he is urging us to help the veteran increase it to about \$110.

Those of us on this side of the aisle would like to see this administration use its efforts to bring these interest rates down, so that there would be plenty of money available to finance these veterans' houses at a lower cost.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator has made his comment, but I want to avoid turning these few remarks of mine into a discussion of housing. I am trying to discuss public works.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator yield one more time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator knows, of course, my close identification with housing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do, indeed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It happens that housing was the No. 1 measure discussed on the fact sheet.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. On the Madison Avenue fact sheet.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I think the Senator will agree that home construction could easily be one of the most effective and one of the quickest methods to use to get into action on any program which could be devised to help pull up the sagging economy.

May I say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that there is not one thing in the proposal of the President related to housing—and I believe this probably applies to all the other subjects—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is not a thing in this proposal that can be effective, even if carried out before the 1st of July, to fight a present recession.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Furthermore, let me say that when the President refers to a housing program which he has submitted to Congress, he is talking about some of the programs he submitted last year. The committee is waiting right now about holding hearings on a new housing program for this year until the administration presents its proposals to us for consideration. We have served notice that we are going to hold those hearings in March, whether the administration has its proposals ready or not.

I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and to the other Members of the Senate that we are going to propose a housing program which will be challenging. We are going to propose a housing program which will help pull us out of this sagging economy or this recession that we are presently in. I hope that the administration, without any of its Madison Avenue phrases and phraseology and techniques, will simply put its shoulder to the wheel and help us put that program across. I believe that if the administration will do that, and will do it with these other potential programs, we can stop this recession and we can start things up again.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

I was trying to support my statements by quotations from the Hagerty docu-

ment. Let me proceed along that line for just a minute.

The Government's portions of these expenditures—

I know now that would be \$175 million for a year for the program, and could not possibly exceed \$500,000 in addition. Mr. Hagerty proceeds:

The Government's portion of these expenditures would be financed by revenues from increased postage rates proposed by the administration and now before the Congress. The budget message has proposed a 5-cent letter rate on out-of-town letters, a 4-cent rate on local letters, and increases in other classes of mail.

The plan contemplates that the postage above 4 cents on first-class mail—namely, the fifth cent on out-of-town letters, which will amount to \$175 million a year—will be used to pay the modernization costs.

The remaining increases would provide about \$500 million a year to reduce the postal deficit, estimated at \$850 million annually, including pending wage increases for postal employees proposed in the budget.

It is clear from that statement that if the proposed increase is granted, the fifth cent of the postage rate on first-class mail will be taken away from financing the Post Office budget or contributing to the payment of the salaries of the postal workers, whose wages are not sufficient to keep pace with the rising cost of living; it will be devoted to the rehabilitation and repair of post office buildings in various parts of the country.

BUILDING POST OFFICES WILL NOT ADD TO REVENUE; RECLAMATION PROJECTS WILL

What I wish to point out is that such expenditures on post offices will not be productive expenditures. They will not add to the revenue of the United States. On the other hand, I invite the attention of Senators to the appropriation bill which was reported by the Appropriations Committee, for public works, on July 12, 1957. This appropriation bill was accompanied by a report. On page 36 of the report, I find this reference to the Colorado River storage project:

Appropriations, fiscal year 1957, \$13 million.

That means that for the fiscal year 1957, \$13 million had been appropriated for this project. The budget estimate for the fiscal year 1958 was \$25,142,000. The House allowance was \$25,142,000. The committee recommendation was \$25,142,000.

BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COLORADO RIVER PROJECT ENDORSED

So it will be seen from the record that at the last session the Appropriations Committee endorsed the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget.

Then there was this statement:

The committee recommends concurrence in the House allowance of the budget estimate of \$25,142,000 for the Colorado River storage project. The funds recommended are for the following units of the project:

Flaming Gorge unit, Utah, \$4,800,000.

Glen Canyon unit, Arizona-Utah, \$17,300,000.

Navaho unit, New Mexico, \$1,800,000.

Transmission division, \$100,000.

Advance planning, \$1,142,000.

The total of those items was the fund appropriated, namely, \$25,142,000.

Then comes this paragraph—and I call particular attention to it:

SIMULTANEOUS CONSTRUCTION OF THREE UNITS PROMISED

The committee recommends the allowances of these funds with the understanding that construction will proceed simultaneously on the Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, and Navaho units of this project.

There, Mr. President, was the understanding of the Congress and the agreement of the Reclamation Bureau. The Department of the Interior made no criticism of that understanding. No change was made until after sputnik appeared in the sky, and then immediately the Bureau of the Budget sent out word that the time had come to cut back on the conservation of water in the arid land States of the West.

HOOVER DAM ALLOWED COLORADO'S WATER TO BE CONSERVED FOR LOWER BASIN

There are three great rivers in this country, namely, the Missouri-Mississippi, the Columbia, and the Colorado Rivers. All three of those streams have been pouring water down since long before the white man inhabited the western part of the United States. In the Colorado River those waters tumbling down to the sea have worn away a great canyon. The waters have gone to waste in the sea, and have not been utilized on the way down, until, under the Presidency of President Hoover, the Hoover Dam was constructed on the lower portion of the Colorado River Basin. The construction of that dam has worked wonders for California and the lower basin. The population of the city of Los Angeles has been multiplied over and over because this great engineering concept of conserving the water instead of letting it go to waste was followed.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT APPROVED BY CONGRESS

States of the upper basin did not reach an agreement as to the division of the waters until several years ago, long after the Hoover Dam had been constructed. Then began efforts to provide for the planning to build the project. I well remember it, because I was a member of the Appropriations Committee at that time, and I was fortunate enough to be able to persuade my colleagues on the committee to appropriate the funds to enable the Bureau of Reclamation to make the studies and draw the plans by which the upper Colorado River storage project could be started.

ADMINISTRATION SHELVED 2 OF 3 PROJECTS

Here was the appropriation for the fiscal year 1958, following one which had been made for 1957, of \$4,800,000, under an understanding that the construction would proceed with Glen Canyon, Navaho, and Flaming Gorge. But Navaho and Flaming Gorge had been effectively placed upon the shelf by the Department.

I am calling attention to the fact that no legislation by Congress is needed. The legislation has already been passed. The authorization bill was passed by the previous Congress. Nothing is needed but Executive action.

The Governors of all four of the upper basin States are supporting this project.

Some of the \$4,800,000 which was appropriated for Flaming Gorge has been expended in the construction of preliminary work, such as access roads and the like; and the promise was made that out of the fund appropriated and still available, the Bureau of Reclamation would be permitted, in December 1957 or January 1958, to call for bids for beginning the construction of the dam.

PROMISE TO CONGRESS NOT KEPT

That promise has been violated. Bids were not called for. No word came in December. I called upon the Bureau of the Budget for some explanation, and received in reply only the old-fashioned notice that my suggestions would "receive careful consideration."

I knew what was going on. I knew that the public works which had been authorized by the Congress, with the agreement of the Bureau of the Budget and the administration, and for which appropriations had already been made, some of which had been expended, were being carefully put back on the shelf.

WHITE HOUSE ACTUALLY HAS STOPPED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

I cannot sit here silent and hear the claim go out from the White House that the White House is launching a public-works program, when the plain facts are that the White House has stopped the public works program.

Mr. President, we have a recession. The best information the Joint Economic Committee could get is to the effect that unemployment will not begin to turn up in March, and that it will be long after the middle of the year before an upturn may be anticipated.

The Bureau of the Budget has very graciously allowed the Bureau of Reclamation to take the unobligated balance of fiscal year 1958 on the Navaho unit, and \$2½ million of the unexpended funds from the Flaming Gorge appropriations, making a total of \$4 million. However, the only action that has been taken was reported to me on January 8, in a release by the Secretary of the Interior. It was to the effect that the Bureau of Reclamation had renegotiated a contract with the Witt Construction Co., whereby 30 units of 80 units of construction on a housing job had been canceled. That is public works in reverse. That is not public works to develop natural resources or an effort to fight unemployment.

I have no hesitation in saying that if this program does not go forward as originally planned and agreed to by the Department of the Interior and Congress, this administration cannot claim that it is a supporter of a public-works program which means anything. The storage of the waters in the Upper Colorado River Basin will mean new wealth for the country. The storage will make it possible to develop the natural resources of that area. I wish to tell Senators, as I told Dr. Saulnier, when he testified on the opening day of the hearings before the Joint Economic Committee, that in two States of the Upper Colorado River Basin, New Mexico and Wyoming, from which public works appropriations are

being withdrawn, there exist the two largest known deposits of uranium anywhere in the United States.

New Mexico, on the basis of presently discovered reserves, stands first. Wyoming stands second. The miners and the engineers who work in Wyoming tell me that the additional operations there will make Wyoming rival New Mexico as a source of uranium.

COLORADO RIVER PROJECT WILL DEVELOP
NATURAL RESOURCES

I say the storage of water in this area in New Mexico and in Utah and in Wyoming and in Colorado will all help to develop the natural resources. We need the development. The Nation needs the development. All of us need the development of those natural resources because we are in the depths of a cold economic war with Soviet Russia.

We know that the interest upon the national debt is increasing by every month during the present administration. The interest on the national debt will be over \$7½ billion this year. That is a greater expenditure than for any other item on the President's budget, save only defense and mutual security. It is \$7½ billion. We are cutting back the appropriation for agriculture. We are cutting back the appropriation for the veterans. They were registered last year for \$5 billion.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator does not wish to be inaccurate in his statement. The interest charge on the national debt is the second largest item in the budget. It is larger than mutual security or defense.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Louisiana misunderstood me, I believe. I joined together national defense and mutual security as the only item which is greater than the interest on the national debt.

Mr. LONG. I am sorry that I misunderstood the Senator. I thought he meant to say that the interest charge on the national debt was not as large as the mutual security appropriations. Of course the Senator knows it is larger.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes. The appropriations to the President, to be expended at his discretion for foreign military aid and foreign economic aid, and other appropriations of that kind, amount to more than \$4 billion. That is the request which is made in the budget before us.

I was making the comparison between the interest on the national debt and all the other activities of Government, save only national defense and mutual security. The interest on the national debt is more than \$7.5 billion, and that amount is next in line to those two items I mentioned, added together.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have published in the RECORD at this point the release which I received from the Bureau of Reclamation, showing the facts which I have recited. I ask that the release be printed in the RECORD at this point so that there may be no challenge of what I have said.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, FISCAL YEAR 1959
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, COLORADO RIVER
STORAGE PROJECT, FLAMING GORGE UNIT,
UTAH

Fiscal year 1958 program-----	\$4,831,899
Funds provided in fiscal year 1959 budget-----	2,500,000
Unobligated balance, fiscal year 1958, Navaho unit transferred to Flaming Gorge-----	1,500,000
Total, fiscal year 1959 program-----	4,000,000

The \$4 million program in fiscal year 1959 will finance the excavation and lining of the single river-diversion tunnel at the dam site. Funds are also programed for the construction of an access road from the Flaming Gorge Government camp to the dam site and a second road from the camp to the river level at the powerplant location.

Construction of service facilities will be completed in fiscal year 1959, including permanent and temporary housing, utilities and streets, and water-supply system, all of which were started in fiscal year 1958.

Amount estimated last year by Bureau of Reclamation for 1959 work in Flaming Gorge, \$12,135,000.

A STRETCHOUT WILL ADD TO THE INTEREST TO
BE PAID BY WATER USERS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me add that it is obvious from what I have already put in the RECORD that Flaming Gorge is not a new start. The first appropriation for the actual work leading to the construction was made for fiscal year 1957. The next one was made for fiscal year 1958. It was planned that the work would be finished in 1963, the engineering program advancing with the need in the appropriation bill and declining as it reached completion.

This was reported to me by the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation: For fiscal 1958 and fiscal 1959, \$12,135,000; fiscal 1960, \$11,770,000; fiscal 1961, \$11,402,000; fiscal 1962, \$10,892,000; fiscal 1963, \$5,207,000.

To build a big project of this kind takes a series of years, with every step of the way carefully outlined and carefully planned.

Congress, in attempting to make sure that this was an economically feasible project, provided that the users should pay interest on the amount of money that was spent during the period of construction. Therefore by the stretchout, the amount of this interest would be increased to a far larger sum than was anticipated. I ask that the Department of the Interior, with the consent of the White House and the Bureau of the Budget, now take up where it left off last December, and begin the work with the money it has. Unless that is done, the burden of repayment upon the users and settlers will be greater than was planned.

ADMINISTRATION DELAY THREATENS COMPLETION OF PROJECT

Indeed, I think it is not too much to say that the stretchout is such that it will threaten the ultimate completion of the project. If that is true, then the people of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and

New Mexico, who would benefit from the utilization of the water that flows through their boundaries, will be the sufferers because of the failure of the administration to carry through to completion a public works program to which it was committed. I hope there will be an immediate change of attitude. I have already sent to the Department of the Interior my request that this shall be done, and I have also sent a message to the Chairman and the Council of Economic Advisers.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these communications be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 12, 1958.

The Honorable FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRED: On receiving word of the President's announcement of a \$2 billion public-works program to stop the recession, I wired Chairman Saulnier, of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, expressing the hope that the authorized call for bids on Flaming Gorge may be immediately made.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Council of Economic Advisers, the Secretary of the Treasury, and Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board, in their testimony given last week before the Joint Economic Committee all adhered to the budgetary program devised in November and December last and presented to Congress in January. Today's announcement reverses all that, and since the appropriation has already been made for the development of the upper Colorado River project there is every reason to hope that the cutbacks in the upper Colorado River project ordered at that time will now be canceled. The development of natural resources, including the construction of reservoirs to store volumes of water now being wasted, will not only stimulate the economy of the areas affected but will result in the production of revenue for the Government.

When the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs met on January 23, I reviewed this whole matter and announced that I would ask the committee formally to condemn the policy of the Bureau of the Budget. The President has done that more effectively than I could have done it by announcing the \$2 billion project.

I am enclosing for your information a copy of my wire to Mr. Saulnier.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

FEBRUARY 12, 1958.

Dr. RAYMOND J. SAULNIER,
Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers,
Executive Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Mindful of our colloquy when you were testifying before the Joint Economic Committee on January 27, I now make the suggestion that, since President Eisenhower, after conference with you, the Council of Economic Advisers, and other top economic officials from Government agencies, has reversed the administration view of the gravity of the recession, it may now be possible to reverse the policy of the Bureau of the Budget which has resulted in a decision not to award a contract on Flaming Gorge for which funds appropriated last year are now available. Four days ago, in pursuance of the Budget Bureau policy, Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton announced that the Bureau of Reclamation had eliminated the

construction of 30 of the 80 housing units at Flaming Gorge for which a contract had already been made. This elimination was due to the failure of the Bureau of Reclamation, under Budget orders, to ask for bids for initial construction on the dam, although the funds were available and Congress had been assured that the contract would be let. This cutback of the authorized program for the development of the conservation project in the Upper Colorado River Basin was formally announced by the Bureau of Reclamation on January 15. Now that a broad program of public works is being announced to stop the recession, I confidently hope that immediate steps will be taken to proceed with Flaming Gorge. No action by Congress is necessary for the resumption of the program on this public work. It requires only action by the Executive.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senator.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I commend the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for a very clear presentation of the conditions with which the people of Colorado are confronted. The program he has outlined and his comments about the necessity for a public works program—or merely the reestablishment of the program which had been approved by Congress—will be a great step forward. I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the able Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

RELIEF OF MARGIE C. STEWART

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and the Senate proceed to the consideration of a concurrent resolution coming over from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 266) requesting the return by the President of the United States of the enrolled bill (H. R. 8038) for the relief of Margie C. Stewart to the House of Representatives for the purpose of reenrolling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 266) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is hereby requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 8038), for the relief of Margie C. Stewart; that if and when such bill is returned by the President, the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the President of the Senate in signing such bill is hereby rescinded; and that the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of such bill, to make the following changes: On page 1, line 9 of the House engrossed bill, strike out "such compensation to be paid at the rate received on the date of removal less any amounts earned by her through other employment during such period or paid to her as unemployment compensation."

OPPOSITION TO INCREASED INTEREST RATE ON LOANS TO RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I recently received from the San Luis Valley Rural Electrification Cooperative a resolution which typifies the feelings of rural Colorado families toward the threats which are presently being directed toward the operation of the REA. I shall ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, it has been clear for some time that the policy of this administration has been to throttle and to discourage the REA. At present there is pending another assault upon this worthwhile program. The administration has given notice that it intends to raise the interest rates on REA loans for the expansion and improvement of rural power and telephone systems. It also wishes to force the rural electrification co-ops to depend on private lending for their capital requirements.

All of us are aware of the situation which prevailed upon our farms before the inauguration of this program. Eighty-nine percent of our farm families did without the blessings of electricity. Whole areas of our Nation were condemned to darkness because the private power companies could not or did not wish to bring light and power. The inauguration and development of the REA and the rural electrification co-ops has brought the number of electrified farms to more than 90 percent. I would think that a program which has enjoyed such astounding success and which has won the unwavering support of farm and rural people—both Democrats and Republicans—would be loyally supported by both political parties.

The fact is, however, that the latest administration moves in reducing the budget for the rural electrification and telephone program and in attempting to increase the interest rate paid on REA loans, are actions hostile to the program and are intended to destroy the vitality of the REA. A year ago, Mr. President, the administration seriously impaired the capacity of the Director of the REA by requiring him to submit for approval loans of more than \$500,000. That action, plus the consistent reduction of budget funds, plus the attempt to increase interest rates, equals a planned and consistent policy of subversion toward the REA which will be bitterly resented and resisted by adherents of the great REA program.

I for one will do everything in my power to prevent an increase in interest rates for rural electrification co-ops and to protect this magnificent program which has more than paid for itself over the last 20 years. Apart from the fact that the co-ops are well in advance of their repayment schedule, this program has accounted for the great intangible benefits found in the health, welfare, and productivity of the American farmer and of American rural people. Moreover, the tax receipts resulting from greater productivity created by electrified farms

have richly rewarded the Federal Treasury for the investment which we have made. Such a program deserves a vote of confidence and the continued support of the Nation.

I now ask that the resolution I have received be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following resolution was presented to the annual meeting of the members of San Luis Valley Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., held at Monte Vista, Colo., on February 1, 1958, its adoption regularly moved and seconded and upon being put to a vote was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the income of the farmers has been steadily decreasing for the past several years; and

"Whereas the cost of items purchased by farmers in the production of their crops has been steadily increasing, which has contributed to the serious financial situation of the farmers at this time; and

"Whereas electricity purchased from rural electric cooperatives is a substantial item in the production costs of farmers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of San Luis Valley Rural Electric Cooperative in annual meeting assembled, go on record as being opposed to the Capehart bill or to any other legislation which would increase the interest rate on loans to rural electric cooperatives, therefore increasing the cost of electricity to farmers; be it further,

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the Colorado Congressional delegation and to the chairman of the House and Senate Agricultural Committees."

I, John R. Wright, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true, full, and correct copy of a resolution adopted at the regular meeting of the members of said association held at Monte Vista, Colo., on February 1, 1958.

Witness my hand and seal of said coöperative this 6th day of February 1958.

JOHN A. WRIGHT,
Secretary.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE ECONOMY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, there are three things which are not surprising about the President's statement on the economy yesterday.

First, the stock market, showing considerable sophistication, went down upon learning about the statement; second, the statement tried to breathe vigor into the economy merely by talking about "confidence," thus raising the shade of Andrew Mellon and projecting the shadow of Herbert Hoover; and third, the statement did not face the facts.

While none of these three things about the President's statement is surprising, all of them are serious; and the failure to face the plain fact is, of course, the most serious. The President said:

It is my conviction that the underlying forces of growth remain strong and undiminished.

What forces of growth?

In a comprehensive speech in the Senate on last August 30, I centered attention upon the fact that the forces of growth in our economy have been languishing seriously for a number of years under the misguided economic policies

of the current administration. Let us now bring this record up to date.

Our economy needs to grow about $4\frac{1}{2}$ percent a year—at the very least, $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent a year—to keep up with the increasing number of people, the increasing number of workers, and the rising productivity per worker; but the actual growth in our total national production, measured in uniform dollars, was only 2.3 percent on the average for the 5 years 1953 to 1957, and only about eight-tenths of 1 percent from 1956 to 1957. Our total national production actually went down 1.7 percent from the fourth quarter of 1956 to the fourth quarter of 1957, measured in uniform dollars. From the third to the fourth quarter of 1957, our total national production went down more than $6\frac{1}{2}$ percent at an annual rate, measured in uniform dollars.

At the base of our economy is consumption by the people. This also needs to grow by about $4\frac{1}{2}$ percent a year. But it grew only $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent on the average during the 5-year period of 1953 to 1957, only 1.7 percent from 1956 to 1957, and less than 1 percent from the fourth quarter of 1956 to the fourth quarter of 1957.

An increasingly higher level of business investment is also essential to our economy. But gross private domestic investments declined by 7.7 percent from 1956 to 1957, and declined by 14.4 percent from the fourth quarter of 1956 to the fourth quarter of 1957.

The industrial production index, according to the most recent figures, is now $7\frac{1}{2}$ percent lower than a year ago.

The incomes of the people have also been tumbling. Farm operators' net income, measured in uniform dollars, was more than 5 percent lower in the fourth quarter of 1957 than in the fourth quarter of 1956. The average per capita income of all the people after taxes, measured in uniform dollars, was $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent lower in the fourth quarter of 1957 than in the third quarter of 1957.

All of these downward trends are becoming worse month by month. The net result is more and more unemployment.

The President's statement of yesterday sheds some crocodile tears about the hardships of unemployment, but it does not even set forth the figures. The census count of unemployment was $4\frac{1}{2}$ million, according to a survey in the middle of January, contrasted with an average of 3 million for the fourth quarter of 1957. But it is now the middle of February, and everybody knows that unemployment has been rising at an accelerating rate. Allowing also for the temporary and part-time unemployment which is not included in the census count, it is very conservative to state that we now have a minimum of $5\frac{1}{2}$ million unemployed, and perhaps close to 6 million.

Practically every expert who has appeared before Congressional committees in recent weeks has estimated a considerable further rise in unemployment. And certainly much more in March than in February.

Practically no expert before any of these Congressional committees has expected an upturn of any kind before

much later this year, and most of these experts are now putting the date of the upturn further and further ahead of us.

So upon what foundation does the President rest his cheerful confidence that March "should mark the beginning of the end of the downturn in our economy"?

The second basis given by the President for his cheerful confidence is that "the firm policy of the Government is to foster this recovery in every sound way."

But the President proposes no vigorous or comprehensive new steps to foster recovery. The so-called fact paper attached to his statement, which I shall not here review in detail, is mostly a review of relatively trivial actions taken by the administration in the past, or mostly a restatement of intended actions already revealed in the weak messages which the President sent to the Congress last month.

So this so-called fact paper really does not introduce a new factor into the situation. In effect, it informs the public that the President and his advisers are hewing stubbornly to the line of their previous belief that all is fundamentally well. But because the economic community knows full well that all is not well, the only real consequence of the President's statement of yesterday is to make things worse, by revealing further the astigmatism of the administration about the whole economic situation.

A telling example of the confusion and stubbornness of the administration is contained in the part of the President's statement dealing with monetary policy and interest rates. In one breath he refers to the "dramatic results already achieved" by some slight modifications of the tight-money policy. But in the very next breath, he censures the Congress for not authorizing higher interest rates—which means still tighter money—on home mortgages.

On several occasions last year, before Congressional committees, on the floor of the Senate, and in other ways, I set forth the terribly damaging consequences of the tight-money policy, based as it is, upon faulty economic analysis, economic injustice, and plain lack of understanding of how our economy really works.

I wish that I might now say that I have been wrong, for the prosperity of our country is far more important than the vindication of any personal views. But month by month and day by day the sad deterioration of the economy has more than justified the action of those of us who early fought this tight-money, high-interest-rate policy, and will continue to fight it until it is abandoned.

At some future time, Mr. President, I hope to avail myself of a fuller opportunity to discuss the whole economic situation, to examine more comprehensively the economic failures of the administration, and to present some details of a specific program for the restoration of our economic health and the resumption of economic progress.

Mr. President, as I said last August 30, the first recommendation I shall

make is that the administration abandon its tight-money, high-interest-rate policy.

THE IMPORTANCE OF REDUCING THE RATES ON COAL SHIPPED TO FLORIDA

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I am hopeful that the Interstate Commerce Commission will speedily approve reduced rates on coal shipped to Florida. These rates from Appalachian to Florida points are now in effect, but only on a temporary basis, subject to further ICC action. Hearings on this question are to be held in Tampa, Florida, on March 11, 1958.

A brief review of the events which led to these hearings may be helpful to an understanding of the issues involved.

The Florida utilities depend in the main on oil as a source-of-energy fuel. In January, 1957, as a result of the Suez crisis, the price of fuel oil, both foreign and domestic, advanced rather sharply. This price advance threatened higher costs for the production of electrical energy among the private utility companies operating in Florida. Because of this situation, the executives of the Florida utilities were willing to explore the possibility of alternate fuels, including coal.

Since Kentucky coal would get its share of any expanded market in Florida, I became interested in this matter. I knew that the price of coal at the face of the mine in Kentucky had changed very little since 1948. I knew also that the energy requirements in the State of Florida were increasing at a more rapid rate than the national average. It seemed to me that the situation presented an opportunity to help the Florida electrical consumer, to help the coal industry in Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia, and to help the railroads serving the Southeast.

In cooperation with Mr. Joseph E. Moody, President of the Southern Coal Producers' Association, I invited the interested parties to a meeting in Washington. As a result of the meeting, engineering studies were made to determine just what needed to be done to expand the coal market in Florida. Subsequent meetings were held, and were attended by representatives of the coal producers, the Florida utilities, the interested railroads, and coal sales agencies.

It soon developed that in order to give the Florida utilities an alternate fuel source and to establish a coal market in Florida, three conditions would have to be met: First, a stable price for coal would have to be assured. Second, freight rates from the coalfields to Florida would have to be lowered. Third, considerable capital investment would be necessary, so that the generating plants in Florida could be equipped to handle and to burn coal as a source of fuel.

The stable coal price did not seem to be any great barrier. It was clearly demonstrated that coal reserves were adequate, and that increased productivity in the coal mines had kept pace with rising wages for the coal miner. Condition

No. 3 did not offer any major barrier, even though sizable investments were necessary. The utilities were willing to make these expenditures, provided fuel costs could be lowered sufficiently to justify them. Some of the existing facilities were already equipped to burn coal. Of those under construction, many were designed for the possible use of coal. The crux of the matter seemed to be condition No. 2—namely, freight rates.

Late last summer, to my gratification and that of others interested in expanding coal's markets, the Southern Railway System, joined by other railroads operating in the South, including the Louisville & Nashville Railroad, proposed rates that would make coal competitive in Florida. It appeared that our efforts had been successful.

The Interstate Commerce Commission at first approved the rates, but they were suspended on October 25, 1957. Later, because of the protest of the railroads and the coal interests, the suspension was vacated, and the rates were put into effect. But the ICC did not let go; the cloud of uncertainty continued to be held over the rates, as the ICC decided to continue to investigate, and now has announced the hearing to which I have referred. This, of course, could continue for a long time.

Obviously, in the present atmosphere of uncertainty, the utilities in Florida are unwilling to invest several millions of dollars in coal-handling facilities. It would be a misuse of their stockholders' funds if they made these investments without being sure that coal would be available to them at a competitive price. Today, they do not have this assurance, because the freight rate is under review. Until the ICC makes a final determination in this matter, it is impossible to develop the movement of coal to Florida to its full potential. Only the plants which now are equipped to handle coal are possible users, so long as uncertainty hangs over the freight rate.

Mr. President, it is generally recognized that the railroads of the Nation face a serious crisis. The relationship between costs and revenues is growing worse from day to day. Only bold steps can save the American railroads. In testifying before the Smathers subcommittee, prominent railroad executives pointed out that many of their troubles stemmed from excessive regulation and legal restriction. In this instance, we certainly have a case in point.

The railroads in this case took a bold and imaginative step which would increase their operating revenue, would protect the interests of the Florida consumer, and would put extra money in the pocket of the coal miner. The welfare of the miner and his family is of great concern to me. Coal is Kentucky's largest industry. The standard of living of hundreds of thousands of Kentuckians is geared directly to coal. My concern about the ICC hearings and the final disposition of this matter under review is therefore understandable.

I am informed that protest was filed against the new coal rate. The members of the ICC undoubtedly felt that an investigation should be made in ac-

cordance with the statutory responsibilities of the Commission. I feel sure that the evidence will conclusively show that the new rate should be approved. I hope the proceedings will be expedited to the fullest, in view of the many benefits that will accrue from the coal-to-Florida program.

INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL REGULATORY AGENCIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from some conversations I have held since I submitted my resolution earlier today, I recognize that there are those who believe that an investigation of the so-called independent agencies should not be conducted by the Senate, in view of the fact that such an investigation is now being conducted by the House of Representatives.

The submission of my resolution today has nothing to do with the fact that there has been a reorganization of the investigation on the House side and that the investigation there now will proceed under the direction of Representative HARRIS, of Arkansas. Yesterday I had a reassuring conversation with Representative HARRIS on this point, but it occurred subsequent to the announcement I made yesterday morning that I would press for a Senate investigation.

I wish to say that from what Representative HARRIS told me, I am satisfied that the House committee will make a thorough investigation and will endeavor to bring order into what I believe all would admit was a considerable amount of confusion in respect to the progress which was being made there in the investigation.

However, Mr. President, I believe that an investigation on the Senate side will prove to be of mutual assistance to the House, just as I believe that an investigation on the House side will prove to be of mutual assistance to the Senate. I am of that belief because of the many phases of the problem which need to be investigated. Therefore, I believe that independent investigations should be conducted by both Houses of the Congress.

It is my understanding that, under the able leadership of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], last year a considerable amount of preliminary work was done with respect to a "look-see" investigation into the independent agencies. It is my further understanding, subject to correction if I am in error, that while our Senate committee was in the process of looking into the independent agencies, the House formally decided upon the investigation that became known as the Moulder investigation, and now the Harris investigation.

I think it is correct to say that a considerable amount of material that had already been collected on the Senate side was turned over to the House. At that time, it would appear, the position taken in this body was that the House investigation would be sufficient; and that may be, Mr. President, except perhaps for this one controlling fact which I believe places upon the Senate the obligation to go forward with an investi-

gation. It is that my telegrams and mail and telephone calls the last few days leave no room for doubt in my mind that the country is greatly concerned about what is happening in the administrative offices of this Government. I think the country is entitled to a dual investigation, and it is for that purpose that I propose to press for action on the part of the Senate and the leadership of the Senate in regard to this matter.

Mr. President, under circumstances that were not of my making, it happened that there came into my possession around midnight last Monday, certain papers that turned out to be Government papers within the jurisdiction, as I believed upon inspection, of the House of Representatives.

Those papers were delivered to my possession around midnight. I made very clear to those delivering them, after I conversed with them a few minutes, that those papers would have to go back to the House of Representatives. They were welcome to leave them in my apartment for safekeeping, and I would take jurisdiction over them, but I wanted it understood that those papers would go back to the House of Representatives. They were left at my apartment with that clear understanding.

Next morning, Tuesday morning, about 10:45 a. m., when I reached my office, I notified the office of the Speaker of the House that I had possession of such papers and that they were available to the House. Yesterday morning I had a conversation with the Speaker. Arrangements were made for the papers to be turned over to Representative HARRIS and Representative FLYNT at the noon hour. I think the papers actually left my apartment sometime after 1 p. m. Tuesday. I turned over to the two Representatives all the papers that Dr. Schwartz and his newspaper companions had left with me in the neighborhood of midnight Monday night.

When Mrs. Morse and I were not home on Tuesday, Mrs. Schwartz delivered to my apartment and turned over to our maid an envelope containing papers that I understood and believed were her personal papers. They were never put by the maid with the other papers, and I did not check those papers until a recent hour. Those papers have also been returned to Mr. HARRIS. When I got to the office this morning I told him those papers had been delivered to me in a separate envelope on Tuesday and that they were being sent to his office.

I want to comment on the contents of that envelope in one particular. I do it without criticism of anyone, but I do it for the RECORD. It is not for me to sit in judgment of anyone involved in this investigation, but in this separate delivery there were not only papers, but there was a wire recording. Mr. President, if my participation in this matter produced nothing else but proof, for my use, as to a practice that I abhor, then I shall always be pleased that I was used as a conduit in this very interesting instance, which I may say, as I have said to some of my colleagues, was

so fantastic that, if it had appeared in a Hollywood movie, no one would have believed it. But the record speaks for itself.

I am not, in these remarks, Mr. President, passing criticisms upon any individuals. I shall be very much surprised if any proof is ever offered that any member of the House committee was aware of this technique. I shall be very much surprised if this was not the idea of some individual staff member.

I want to serve notice that in the next few days I shall offer a bill which will make it completely clear that no investigator for any Congressional committee, at any time, under any circumstances, in regard to any matter, will ever be authorized to interview anyone, in or out of Government, and at the time of interview have concealed on him a recorder that is taking down the conversation unknown to the person being interviewed.

I simply cannot imagine, in a democracy, a situation of such a nature that can possibly justify the use of such a technique.

As the Senate knows, the practice violates all my convictions in regard to the doctrine of privacy. I do not believe the use of such a technique is ever necessary to get the facts, or is ever justified in getting the facts if that is the only way they can be obtained, because I happen to hold to the view that there are things worse than not being able to get the facts, and one of them is to adopt techniques that in my judgment violate personal privacy. I want the record to show that this is all I need to know. If it could happen once, it could happen many times in the future if something is not done to stop it. If it has happened once, who knows how many times it has happened heretofore?

That is all I am going to say about it, Mr. President. I sent the envelope that was delivered to my maid on Tuesday, with all of its contents, including this wire recording, to the House committee. I want to say that I hope that whatever the contents of that recording may prove to be, they will not be used in connection with any hearing involving the particular Government official who was thus tapped and his privacy thus invaded. I am against the invasion of anyone's privacy by any form of tapping.

I wanted to say that, because I think this is a clear illustration now to the Congress of the soundness of the position the senior Senator from Oregon has taken for some years in the Senate in opposition to all forms of wiretapping. I said once that what we needed was legislation which clearly made illegal all forms of wiretapping, and I was told we could not get such legislation passed. We are going to find out this session, Mr. President, because the Senate is going to have an opportunity to go all the way. I think now is the time for legislation to be introduced which will make it illegal for any form of wiretapping to be used in the administration of any phase of the Government of the United States. I shall never accept the theory that we have to use police-state methods in order

to catch certain people about whom we can get the facts in no other way.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to commend the Senator from Oregon for his observation that his desire to see the investigation continue is not meant in any way to interfere with or to cast any aspersion or insinuation upon the other body. The Members of the other body have a responsibility and an obligation, and they are going to assume it. The Senator from Oregon has been explicit on that point.

Mr. MORSE. May I interrupt the Senator at that point to say that I am satisfied the Members of the other body had no knowledge of the recording, because I read from the news ticker this comment:

Representative WILLIAMS, Democrat, of Mississippi, demanded to know why the committee had not been told previously of the existence of the recording.

That certainly makes clear in my mind that the members of the committee knew nothing about the recording.

Mr. CARROLL. I must say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I had reference to the entire investigation with which they are going to proceed.

May I say to my friend, the Senator from Oregon, that yesterday, before I knew the Senator was going to offer a resolution providing for a select Senate committee for investigation of this matter, I spent a considerable time with lawbooks to determine what, if any, jurisdiction the Senate Committee on the Judiciary had in this matter. I did not do so in a desire to interfere, to delay, to hinder, or to obstruct what the other body was doing in its investigation, but I desired to learn what might be done in the entire field of correcting some of the unethical practices which we have been hearing about for many years with reference to regulatory agencies. I wanted to study these agencies and the administrative law and administrative procedures under which they functioned.

I have come up with certain conclusions, but I certainly do not desire to interfere with the consideration of the resolution introduced by the Senator if the Senate desires to proceed independently on its own investigation.

Mr. MORSE. May I interrupt the Senator at that point?

Mr. CARROLL. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I want to make perfectly clear that if the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Government Operations, and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce agree among themselves as to which of these committees ought to go ahead with an investigation as a standing committee, I am perfectly willing to modify my resolution accordingly.

I am very frank to say to the Senator from Colorado that I introduced the resolution to provide for a select committee because I think that is an excel-

lent vehicle for such an investigation and, secondly, because I have been in the Senate long enough to know that it is rather difficult to get agreement among committees on jurisdictional matters. There is always a reticency or hesitation on the part of committees to give up what they consider may likely be their jurisdiction, because of the argument, "We cannot establish a bad precedent."

Of course, no bad precedent is established when the Senate as a body decides that because several committees have jurisdiction it is going to create what is known as a special or select committee.

May I say, while I am on this point, that there is one thing about the resolution which I want the press to understand. This resolution does not provide for one of the 50-50 committees. I am not a Member of the Senate who supports the policy of having committees where membership is equally divided between the parties.

I believe that whatever party is in the majority in the Senate has the majority responsibility. The majority party ought to insist upon having a majority of members on an investigating committee. My proposed select committee would not be a 50-50 committee. It would be a committee with a majority of Democrats on it, because I think the Democratic Party has a responsibility to the American people to conduct an investigation of alleged wrongdoing in the Eisenhower administration.

I have a sense of humor about it, although I see the tragedy of it, too. It was not so many years ago that a Democratic administration was being thoroughly pummeled by the other side of the aisle when the evidence was minute with regard to wrongdoing, compared with what I am satisfied is the wrongdoing of the present administration.

I think my party has an obligation to conduct a thorough investigation, with a committee on which there is a majority of Democrats, with all the minority rights reserved to Republicans, including their right to minority staff members to assist them. I think it is that kind of investigation which usually does the job. It is the kind of investigation which throughout our history has produced great cleanups in Government.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct. There are standing committees with overlapping functions and overlapping jurisdictions. For example, it might be argued that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has jurisdiction over the approval of certain commissioners of regulatory agencies who are nominated by the President. It might be argued that the Government Operations Committee has jurisdiction, because it has to do with the economy and efficiency of the Government.

By the same token, the Judiciary Committee—and I offer this example only to stimulate the thinking not only of the Senator from Oregon, but of other

Senators who may read the RECORD—has complete jurisdiction in all judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, and jurisdiction over the Federal courts and judges. Among other matters over which it has jurisdiction are the revision and codification of statutes of the United States.

The question is, Does the Judiciary Committee have jurisdiction over quasi-judicial bodies? I contend that it does.

Twenty years ago, in 1939, Franklin Roosevelt created a commission to study the administrative procedures of a great and growing Nation. Since that time our economy has expanded from an \$80 billion national income to a national income of some \$360 billion. The Government has become the biggest business in the country.

I know that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon is not only an outstanding Senator, but an able lawyer. I had not intended to participate in this discussion until my attention was drawn by the mention of wiretapping.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator has participated.

Mr. CARROLL. What would happen if wiretapping occurred in the case of a Federal judge, or a judge of a State court, or a Supreme Court judge?

Mr. MORSE. Let me add to what the Senator says that the Administrative Procedures Act was the product of the commission appointed by President Roosevelt. My recollection is that that subject was under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee in the Senate.

Mr. CARROLL. Exactly.

Mr. MORSE. So, in one sense, it could be said that the Judiciary Committee has a certain jurisdictional interest in any investigation which might be conducted with respect to the administrative bodies to which the Administrative Procedures Act applies.

Mr. CARROLL. Only recently the American Bar Association requested additional procedural rules and administrative law, and it is my understanding that a bill for that purpose now reposes in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The real point upon which I wish to comment has been emphasized by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. It is one thing to conduct an investigation into the question of malfeasance on the part of a particular individual. It is quite another thing to conduct an investigation into the appointment of individuals who are not passing upon small claims, as is very often done in State courts, but passing upon claims involving many millions of dollars. Such claims may involve not only individuals or industries, but sometimes entire communities.

For example, in the State of Colorado, we now have before the Federal Power Commission a case which has been decided against the company by an FPC trial examiner. The case involves some \$50 million. That case will be passed upon by the Commissioners. The Commissioners are appointed by the President.

The real point, which I do not believe has been sufficiently emphasized, is the fact that State courts, municipal courts,

and Federal courts are manned by lawyers, and the conduct of these lawyers, who have become judges, is regulated by statute in a very limited sense. A cursory examination of Federal laws discloses that, with respect to Federal judges, there is a law applying to bias and prejudice. Another statute applies to a judge who has a financial interest in a case. Still another statute deals with nepotism. However, through hundreds of years of tradition in the courts, there has developed a code of conduct which the judges must follow. For example, they must not confer privately with litigants in their chambers.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Oregon that apart from the specific acts of malfeasance, there is another category of offenses called misfeasance, or acts of omission. Acts of commission may be subject to investigation, but it seems to me that if we are to strike at the heart of the problem, we must begin to establish by statutory law standards for the conduct of the men who administer our laws.

Without criticism of Republicans, let me say that Democrats have been subjected to some criticism, too.

This question goes to the crux of the matter. That is why I am hopeful that the select committee, or the Judiciary Committee—which could very easily set up a new subcommittee—will go into the question of how to restore morality and good government and codes of ethical practices in the regulatory agencies which should be representing the people instead of some of the industries which they are supposed to regulate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I could not possibly agree more completely with the Senator from Colorado on any matter than I agree with the observations he has just made. I am glad he made them, because they bear directly upon a recommendation which I shall be making to the Senate in the not too distant future.

The other night, in a long conference which I was conducting with Mr. Berg, my administrative assistant, and Mr. Bernstein, who is counsel to a subcommittee of which I am chairman, we discussed exactly this point.

What is happening in our so-called independent agencies or administrative bodies is that they rely upon their separate rules and regulations, which they themselves have devised for governing their so-called professional conduct. That is fine. It is a good thing for them to do so. However, that does not relieve the Congress of the United States of the very responsibility which the Senator from Colorado has just pointed out.

In my opinion, long before this time we should have enacted a code of conduct binding upon the behavior of quasi-judicial officers serving in administrative tribunals. It is the old question of Caesar's wife being above suspicion. After all, the public judges Government agencies in no small measure by the extent to which they are free from suspicion.

There is much suspicion. This becomes a matter of cumulative effect. I am inclined to believe—at least I wish to believe, and I pray that this is the worst that can be shown—that the so-

called conflict of interest or misbehavior that may be developed by any investigation would be limited to rather minor affairs, which in and of themselves do not seem to be very important, but when they are repeated and repeated, over and over again, by various special interests in relationship to quasi-judicial officers, they place the officer and the agency under a cloud of suspicion. For example, Administrator X, serving on a regulatory body, speaks at a convention of a segment of the industry which is regulated by that body; the persons holding the convention pay his fare and the fare of his wife; they pay his hotel bill and the hotel bill of his wife, including the orchids; they give him wonderful hospitality, and expensive hospitality. Mr. President, that official can sit on that administrative tribunal, with that industry before him, and give an impartial judgment. I am satisfied of that. However, if there is an accumulation in the record of instances in which he engages in that kind of relationship with the people in an industry subject to the regulation of the body on which he sits, are we going to be shortsighted enough to think that he is going to meet the Caesar's wife maxim, that he can hope to keep himself above suspicion? I say that the public will become suspicious.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. As the Senator from Oregon knows, I have been a Member of the Senate for only 1 year. However I have had some experience in and around Washington, both by way of service in the House and in the executive branch of the Government.

I believe that if the President of the American Bar Association or if any member of the American Bar Association were asked today whether he could have a private conference in behalf of a litigant before one of the Commissioners of these important regulatory agencies, the answer would be yes. In other words, a custom and practice has grown up in regard to these agencies which I believe is detrimental to the public interest and to the private rights of a man. I believe something ought to be done about it. This is not a matter that has grown up only during the past year. It has been growing up over a period of years. That is why I say, no matter how desirable the House investigation may be, and no matter how desirable a special investigating committee may be for the time being, or for 6 months or 2 months, if we do not strike at the really cancerous condition beneath the surface, by promulgating some rules of conduct or a code of conduct which will call these people to account, something will happen again in a year or two.

We use the term quasi-judicial. The Commissioners of these regulatory agencies function in a judicial capacity, but they also function in a legislative capacity, because they promulgate rules and regulations. These positions call for a high type of individual who will know when he may talk about legislative business and when he must not talk to anybody about judicial decisions.

I am not sufficiently informed on this subject to say just what must be done. I have not had an opportunity to investigate this matter thoroughly. I worked on it yesterday, and have reached back into the books, trying to find precedents, to learn what is the jurisdiction of the various committees.

It must be remembered lawyers are not the only persons who have a high sense of ethics, or a high sense of morals in conduct of their profession. However, traditionally they have a great obligation placed upon them. Many times a technician sitting in a regulatory agency job does not understand the effect of years of litigation, and what a judge or a quasi-judge must or must not do.

Therefore, I believe an investigation into the conduct of quasi-judicial Commissioners would be helpful, even though it might not be as newsworthy as other investigations which are being conducted at the present time, valuable as they are.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe it would be helpful. I thank the Senator for his comment. It relates to the point that I was making, because we in Congress owe an obligation to these administrators which we have not fulfilled.

It is very easy to take the position that these administrators are doing what they want to do, or what they would prefer to do, in regard to the area we are discussing and in regard to their contracts with representatives of the industries they are regulating.

I have a hunch that they would throw their hats up in the air and figuratively shout "hurrah" if Congress were to pass legislation which left no room for doubt that, as the Senator has said, they could not have a personal conference with a lawyer and a litigant in regard to a case before the Commission; that they could not, for example, accept any form of hospitality of the representatives of any group that is going to be regulated; that we have laid down a rather strict code of professional conduct binding upon those administrative agencies; that when they received their confirmation from the Senate of the United States they knew that they automatically became bound by the code. I have a feeling that they would enthusiastically welcome such action.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Would the Senator from Oregon not say that they would welcome it, and that it might be good for Congress itself to be aware of such a code?

Mr. MORSE. I am coming to that in a moment. I have some suggestions to make with regard to Congressional behavior. I have felt this way for a good many years, and I will press my proposed legislation again.

However, I am talking now about people who hold quasi-judicial positions, who are not elected by ballot box voting; who are not elected officials but are appointed officials. I believe that we in Congress have the duty of providing them with legislation which will give them the direction in these matters they ought to have from us.

By singling out a specific incident, the situation takes on the appearance of being petty, minimus, and inconsequential; to wit: Who among us will say, if a member of a Commission accepts a couple of tickets for himself and his wife to My Fair Lady, and goes to the theater with the attorney, who may be a former bar acquaintance of the administrative officer, that there is any real justification for being suspicious as to whether any case that may be pending before the Commission within a short time will be voted upon by that Commissioner in any other manner than an impartial manner?

I am not going to be one who would say that the Commissioner could not do that and still be impartial. However, I will say that, outside of what the Senator from Colorado and I, as lawyers, know are the formal programs of a bar association meeting, where we come in contact with judges during those programs, and have the social relationships that go along with a convention dance or a convention banquet, or go along with other entertainment features of the convention itself, at which we move and have our being in the full view of all the other members of the convention, except for situations such as that, the out-of-the-court-room and the out-of-the-administrative-hearing-room relationship between an official and representatives of litigants and the litigants themselves should be one of arms' length.

I think it has to be that way if we expect to keep our Commissions, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it not true that a practice has grown up—perhaps it is not true in Oregon, and perhaps not in Colorado—in which special pleading is conducted before the regulatory bodies, and Senators or Representatives are expected by certain constituents to attempt to influence the decision? Does the Senator from Oregon desire to comment on that situation?

Mr. MORSE. I have had a few—and I am proud to say only a few—constituents in 13 years whom I have had to help to educate along that line. But it is interesting that the Senator from Colorado should mention it today, because only yesterday morning I spent more than an hour in the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Supply and Logistics with a constituent, with my administrative assistant, and with a member of the staff of the Select Committee on Small Business. We were there to discuss whether or not in the Pacific Northwest the Military Establishment was following a course of action which could be justified in view of the allegations which are being presented to the Oregon delegation that the States of Oregon and Washington are being discriminated against.

I asked for that appointment. In my 13 years in the Senate, I have never asked an administrative officer of the Government to come to my office, I may say in passing, because I used to sit in the executive branch of the Government and get telephone calls from irate Senators

and Representatives who, not too politely, said, "Get yourself up here." I would come to their offices, sit down, and listen to their complaints about what they considered to be the injustices of the War Labor Board.

I learned some very valuable lessons from those experiences. On the basis of those lessons, I resolved, when I came to the Senate, that when I had business with executive officials involving the interests of my State, I would go to them. The people in the administrative offices are just as busy as I am, and merely because I am a Senator I have no right, as we say, to drag them up by the heels. I resolved that I would go and talk to them entirely on one major premise, namely, the merits of my case.

I have always made it clear, as I did yesterday morning, that unless the evidence as presented by my constituents stands up on its merits, they are not entitled to a favorable decision; and I am just as much interested in the welfare of my country as a whole as I am in the welfare of my State. I made it clear yesterday morning that Oregon is not entitled to a thing that it cannot justify, on the merits, in regard to this matter under the jurisdiction of the Defense Department. We presented our case on that basis.

I mention this because the Senator from Colorado and I, and all the other Members of the Senate, too, have an obligation to make clear to our constituents that they have a stake in good government. We have no right, when they let a selfish interest of theirs blind themselves to the practice of good government, to support them in that myopia.

I may say, in behalf of the administrative agencies and departments of the Government, that I have found that when a person has a case on the merits, he can be pretty certain that he will win. It is very easy for people to get the notion that in the various administrative departments and agencies of the Government, such as the Department of Labor, the Department of Justice, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and others, someone is constantly at work to see how much injustice he can do. Mistakes in judgment may be made; but, by and large, I am perfectly willing to testify that most of the time I feel the decisions I have received on Oregon problems have been decisions made on the merits. It has sometimes taken me longer than I had hoped to produce sufficient evidence to convince the particular body which had the right to make the decision that our case was meritorious; but this illustrates the very point which the Senator from Colorado is making.

I agree with him that we in Congress have no right to use what amounts, in common parlance, to political pressure in order to get something for our States, if on the merits our States do not deserve it.

Mr. CARROLL. I can understand, sometimes, the political pressure brought to bear on economic questions; but my question was really directed to what affects the property rights of the individuals, some of which may serve our own areas. But when we violate that

rule, we deprive someone else of those rights.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. They would no more think of asking a Member of Congress to go into a court in Washington to influence a judge than they would back home.

The quasi-judicial bodies, in an expanding population and an expanding economy, need competent persons, with high mental ability and complete integrity, persons who will draw the line as to what people can do and what they must not do to influence litigation.

I know that the Senator from Oregon wishes to proceed with his speech. He is making an excellent presentation. I say only this in conclusion: I do not profess to know about wire recording or wiretapping, but 20 years ago when I was district attorney in Denver, there was such a case. A microphone had been placed in the executive chambers of the Governor of Colorado. The persons who were involved were well intentioned. They thought they were going to save the community. But by their action they did more harm to themselves and to the community because all of them were later convicted in a court of law.

Wiretapping is not the proper way to expose misconduct. The way to do it is to continue to throw the spotlight of Congressional and law-enforcing agencies on misconduct in such a way that all persons can understand what is happening.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Oregon for expressing his faith and confidence in Speaker RAYBURN, under whom I served for two terms. Speaker RAYBURN is the father of many of the regulatory bodies. I know personally how he feels. He wants them to be staffed by persons of integrity. He has watched these agencies grow, and I know he wants them administered according to the highest code of ethics.

However, I feel the time has come to have a full-blown investigation to strengthen the procedures followed in quasi-judicial agencies, to clarify and strengthen the policy of the Government, and to inform fully those who pass judgment on issues of vital interest to the Nation what is the code of ethics to be observed in quasi-judicial proceedings.

Mr. MORSE. I support the last statement of the Senator from Colorado. I am satisfied that both Speaker RAYBURN and Representative HARRIS have become rightfully concerned about, shall I say, the mess that has developed in connection with the investigation of the independent agencies. As they have said to the press, they are determined to see to it that on the House side a thorough investigation is made of the problem.

I think that similar proceedings should be instituted by the Senate, because I think we have a joint responsibility in the matter.

The Senator from Colorado made reference to the obligation of Members of Congress, also, to follow a code of professional conduct which will remove Congress from unjustifiable suspicion. I quite agree. My colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER],

has discussed this question on many occasions. I find myself in complete agreement with him that there is need for some legislation. For many years I have introduced in the Senate at each session, and shall press for it again at this session, proposed legislation which would require that there be a public disclosure of the source of income and the amount of income of all Members of Congress and of all members of Government agencies who receive a salary of \$10,000 or more. I believe there is no substitute for full public disclosure. The voters are entitled to be the judges as to whether there is any relationship, direct or indirect, between the record of a Member of Congress in respect to issues and the sources of his income.

They should be allowed to be the judges of whether there is any relationship, either direct or indirect, between the decisions made by one sitting on one of the regulatory bodies and the sources and amounts of his income.

Anyone who does not want such public information about his income to exist should not run for office. If he does not want to live in a glass house, so to speak, he should stay back home. I believe such a reform would be very helpful.

Congress should enact legislation along other lines of reform. Today there is not on the statute books adequate legislation to protect the people in the case of campaign contributions. That is another point which my colleague from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] has discussed frequently. Just recently he did so, in a speech he made in Washington. I hope that at this session the Congress will pass some of the proposed legislation—which still is pending in committee—which seeks at least to improve that situation.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARROLL in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I have been very much interested in the Senator's remarks. I am particularly anxious, as he is, to have the Congress enact legislation setting up codes, so to speak, to be applicable to the quasi-judicial, independent agencies, as well as to all other departments of the Government.

I had some experience with travel and travel pay, when I served as an officer of the State Department. In the State Department, the numerous Presidential appointees were not permitted to travel to make speeches, unless they traveled at Government expense. For instance, if Under Secretary of State Murphy or if one of the Assistant Secretaries of State was requested to address the National Council of Churches at Cleveland, Ohio, or at Los Angeles, Calif., if he made the speech as an officer of the State Department, despite the fact that during some of those years the Department had a very limited budget to be used for travel expenses, the trip had to be made at Government expense, and the officer had to travel on a per diem allowance. That was a matter of State Department rule, not a matter of law. I believe that

rule has existed in the State Department for some time.

So I believe we are faced with a challenge in connection with this matter. I hope the Congress will enact legislation which will remove any question as to whether it will be proper or correct for a Member of Congress to be paid to make a speech. I hope that determination will be made by law.

I commend the Senator from Oregon for his discussion of this subject.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky and I had an interesting experience, this fall, in connection with this subject. Since that time I have not discussed the matter with him. However, I made a report on it to the Foreign Relations Committee. He and I, together with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], made a trip to India. In the course of that trip, there were placed upon me some responsibilities rather different from those which were placed upon my very able colleague, the Senator from Kentucky, and my very able colleague, the Senator from Kansas. As I said at the breakfast yesterday morning, at the conference both the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Kansas made fine records, which I think were of great credit to our country.

As chairman of the group, I had the responsibility of signing the vouchers. As the Senator from Kentucky knows, we traveled most economically. However, I encountered one problem which will be of interest to both the Senator from Kentucky and to the Senate as a whole: I was surprised to find that some of our embassies and some of our consulates were so short of representation funds that the ambassadors or consuls general would pay from their own pockets the expenses of what actually were official representation functions or affairs. As one of them said to me, it would have been a matter of comment if such affairs had not been held. I said to the Foreign Relations Committee that I did not think a consul general or an ambassador should be called upon to pay from his own pocket for such functions.

One of them provided the necessary funds to the subordinates on his staff, because he said, his salary was larger than theirs. So when the agricultural attaché, for instance, had to go to a village, to participate in a function there, if our program was to be successful, the consul general paid the expenses out of his own pocket.

In the course of our trip, we participated in some affairs which I knew would otherwise be paid for out of the pockets of our embassy or consulate officials. However, I had authority to draw upon counterpart funds, in order to pay the bill; and that is exactly what I did. I am glad I did so. I reported the matter to the Foreign Relations Committee. It would have been most improper in my judgment, for the bill to be paid in that instance by the consul general.

Furthermore, as some Senators have heard me say on the floor of the Senate, I believe we should put the counterpart

funds to use, anyway, in the case of particular governmental activities. So that is what I did.

But as the Senator from Kentucky has stated, this matter relates to the need for a complete review of the entire question of expense allowances and per diem allowances—which, I believe, are far too small in some instances—and the entire question, as the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, of the making of speeches for honoraria. In a moment I shall have something to say about that, in the case of Members of Congress.

It seems to me there is a need at this session of Congress to make a complete review of the entire field of so-called professional conduct on the part of Government officials.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. On the subject of representation allowances, I hope we shall take a more realistic approach to that matter, in connection with our handling of the State Department appropriation this year. As the Senator from Oregon knows, the Senate has considerable trouble with the other body on that appropriation. The Senate has traditionally allowed a larger amount of funds for that purpose, but in conference the conferees on the part of the Senate have had to yield to the conferees on the part of the House.

I can state that when the time came for the big Fourth of July party to be given, one of the military attachés—for either the Air Force, the Navy, or the Army—often volunteered to pay the check, or a major portion of it, for the Ambassador's party.

Just think of a situation in which our ambassador, the official representative of the United States in a country—has to accept from one of our service attachés the stipend with which to pay for the Fourth of July reception for the American nationals who reside in that particular country.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to hear that statement by the Senator from Kentucky. When that matter comes up this year, I shall be able to present some testimony to the Foreign Relations Committee; and I know the Senator from Kentucky will join me in the presentation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe I understand the position of the Senator from Oregon and my good friend, the Senator from Kentucky, on this matter.

I happen to be a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. I am sure the Congress does not provide sufficient amounts of representation money in order to allow our official representatives to carry out this function. I am one of those who take that view. Our Foreign Service is a good one. One has to travel in the field to realize that best.

In Buenos Aires our country was represented by a man who could afford to pay the entertainment expenses. However, in the majority of cases either the consul general, the Ambassador, or

whatever other official represents the United States, cannot afford to pay the bills. Generally he is a career man who has risen from the ranks.

At Buenos Aires the British had \$100,000 for representation money. But, although for years the United States has been sending money to the British, our Ambassador to Great Britain had, for representation purpose, only \$5,000.

I have seen the late Josephus Daniels entertain possibly 1,500 American citizens at the United States Embassy in Mexico City. Someone had to pay the bill, but I know it could not have been paid with the representation money our Government was allowing. So I agree fully with both Senators.

Incidentally, I agree completely with what the Senator from Oregon has in mind at the moment. I shall join him in voting for the resolution.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Speaking now as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. President, I wish to say that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], as a member of the Appropriations Committee, has always been of great help to the members of the Foreign Relations Committee when they have appeared before his committee to present this representation problem. I thank him for his assistance.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

FULL PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF SOURCES AND AMOUNTS OF INCOME OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND CERTAIN OTHER OFFICIALS OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is one other phase of this subject I had not intended to discuss this afternoon but it was raised by the distinguished Senator from Colorado. In the interest of a rounded discussion, I should discuss it. I have already said I think there should be full public disclosure of the sources and amounts of income of Members of Congress, as well as of other officials of Government who receive salaries of \$10,000 or more.

In some of the radiocasts and televisioncasts and news comments of recent days, there has been a discussion of the propriety of quasi-judicial officers accepting honoraria for speeches they make while serving on the bench, and speeches before conventions of groups that may be subject to the regulations of the particular commission concerned. Say these radio commentators, "What about Senators and what about Representatives?" Well, I think that my public-disclosure bill would certainly put the public in a position so that it could answer the question, "What about them?"

But I do wish to point out that there is a great deal of difference between holding an elective office and holding an appointive office. When one is appointed to an office, he is appointed to that position as his full-time occupation. That is his job. The salary designated is the one that goes with the posi-

tion. I think it can be said quite correctly that under those circumstances he should confine himself to the office to which he has been appointed; and it should be recognized, so far as the use of his time is concerned, as his full-time job in respect to income. A man elected to an elective office in the Congress of the United States has never in our history been understood to be one who was elected to a so-called full-time job in the sense that he is not free, within his ability in performing the obligations of his office, to supplement his income from other sources.

Many Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate maintain their positions in law offices, subject only to the rule of ethics of our profession that they shall not participate in any case involving a Federal question which might involve a so-called conflict of interest with their position in the Congress. Some of us in the legal profession who are in the Congress have taken the position that we would not maintain any financial connection with our law offices while we sat in Congress, but would become, if we were to maintain any connection with the law office, counsel to that office, which means there would be no participation at all in the economic activities and there would be no participation in the cases of the office. That was the position I took for some years here in the Senate, until I finally decided that I would go even a step further and resign from my law firm, which I did.

But, Mr. President, this particular job in the Congress carries with it a great many obligations, including the obligation of political education. I look upon my position pretty much as a teaching job. As an elected officer of the people of my State, it seems to me I have an obligation to inform the people in regard to the problems of Government as I see those problems. Therefore I, like a good many other of my colleagues, from time to time give lectures before universities, union conventions, employer conventions, service clubs, chambers of commerce, and other organizations, in which instances on some occasions an honorarium is received, which is, of course, a matter of public knowledge. If the law I propose should be enacted, everyone in my State will be the judge as to whether or not the supplementing of my income, by lectures or by articles, which some of us from time to time write, in any way gives rise to conflict with my duties here in the Senate.

As the present Presiding Officer of the Senate [Mr. CARROLL] well knows, many of us here are, by and large, men without other sources of income than our Congressional salaries. The books are perfectly clear. We could not do what we should try to do if we did not supplement our incomes to some extent, unless we were willing to cut down on our senatorial work, which would mean cutting down some of the expenses in connection with our telegraph and telephone bills, and the like. I opposed a salary increase for Members of Congress because it has been my opinion that there should be legislation enacted so that it would not be necessary for Members of Congress to use out-of-pocket money for carrying on

the duties of one's office, but that there should be a publicly disclosed expense account sufficiently high to cover the actual expenses of serving as a Member of Congress, so that one would not have to do extra work in order to pay for the cost of performing his service as a Member of Congress.

I have discussed this question at other times in the Senate, but I wanted to bring it up at this time because of an editorial which appeared in the Grants Pass Courier. That is not a Morse paper, as most of the papers in Oregon are not, but that paper contained a scurrilous editorial which commented on the fact that I had been out to Oregon recently and had spoken at a Democratic rally in Portland, Ore. The question was raised, "Did the Government pay his expenses?"

Of course, I pointed out the Government had never paid my expenses on any trip that was not an official Government trip. If I took a trip that was an official Government trip, which this last one was, but did not limit myself entirely to Government business, then I paid my own expenses, as I did on this last occasion. On this last trip to Oregon, I carried out a pledge made last fall to inspect, with the Army engineers, the Reedsport Harbor at Reedsport, Ore. It was impossible for me to do it in December because I was in India with my friend from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who has arrived on the floor, and about whom I made remarks a few minutes ago with respect to the magnificent work which he and the Senator from Kentucky performed at the Inter-Parliamentary Conference at New Delhi. My trip to Reedsport had to be postponed, and I went to Oregon a while ago to keep that commitment. But I did not make it an official Government trip, as I could have, because I had accepted invitations to speak, while in Oregon, before three Democratic meetings. I did not feel I could ethically justify collecting any money from the Federal Government for a trip devoted in part to political activities.

For the benefit of this anti-Morse editor at Grants Pass, Ore., I told him I wanted him to know where I did get the money, because he seemed to think I was doing right well, if the Government did not pay my expenses, if I could take such a costly aircraft trip back home.

May I say the reactionary forces in Oregon hope I will stay broke, because they feel that is the best way to keep me in Washington so every time I do fly back to mend the fences, as we say, some anti-Morse editor raises the question, "Where did he get the money?"

So I satisfied the curiosity of this editor in a letter yesterday by pointing out that my ticket was paid for, along with reasonable travel expenses, by the Democratic Party of Long Beach, Calif., which I addressed on my way back from Oregon. I was told that was the largest Democratic banquet ever held in Long Beach, Calif., which I thought was pretty good, in view of the fact that the banquet was a fund-raising banquet at a cost of \$10 a plate.

I felt somewhat in this rather facetious mood because of the trend this dis-

cussion has taken, but now, in all dead seriousness, I say, Mr. President, I do hope that in this session of Congress we shall pass legislation which will make the financial activities of Members of Congress and other Government officials who receive \$10,000 or more a year a matter of public disclosure.

Mr. President, I now desire to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

OIL FOR EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to discuss now oil for education. This is not a new subject for me on the floor of the Senate. I remember that I discussed it once for 22 hours and 26 minutes. The Press Gallery may relax. I expect to discuss the subject now only about 20 minutes.

Certain happenings in Texas of recent days have intensified my interest in this subject. We have not solved the problem of oil for education yet in regard to the Continental Shelf.

Perhaps the single, most outstanding issue which has earned for the Eisenhower administration the title of a "give-away" administration has been the issue of the submerged lands, the jurisdiction over lands off our shores beyond the mark of lowest tides.

This historic fight will be remembered from its relationship to the education of our boys and girls. When oil, sulfur, and other minerals were discovered under the sea off California and in the Gulf of Mexico it was proposed that the money from the rents, royalties, and bonuses payable to the Government under development leases be used for the improvement of the Nation's schools.

This was the famous oil-for-education amendment, and I have been proud to be one of its sponsors and among its most vigorous advocates. Devoting this revenue from the wealth in our public lands to education would have been in line with the Land Ordinance of 1785, which reserved one lot in every township in the Northwest Territory for support of the schools within the township and it would have been in keeping with the Morrill Act of 1862, whereby institutions of higher learning received areas of public land to manage, together with whatever proceeds the land brought in, to improve and expand their facilities. These became the great land-grant colleges and universities of today.

The oil-for-education proposal would have continued this principle of using the public lands for support of education.

It was a proposal that bore the name of the great Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and is commonly referred to as the Hill amendment.

I digress to pay tribute to the great Senator from Alabama, who during his years in the Senate has been one of the finest educational statesmen of America, because in the field of education we have pressed, and pressed hard, for legislation which would bring to the boys and girls of America those educational opportunities they must have if America is to carry out that great tenet of Thomas

Jefferson, namely, that a democracy can be no stronger than the enlightenment of its people, and their enlightenment in no small measure is determined by the quality of their education system. That is why the great giveaway that occurred when the Eisenhower administration sided with the States in their claim to ownership out to the 3-mile limit was a severe blow to our education system.

As a matter of fact, the giveaway pledge was given before Eisenhower ever took office. It was given while Eisenhower and the late Senator Taft were still the major candidates for the Republican nomination. Shortly before the convention, General Eisenhower sent a wire to one of his leading Texas supporters, Houston oilman H. J. Porter. In it he said:

I see no conflict in this responsibility [for national resources essential to the national security] which interferes with the vesting of title of tidelands in the States.

As President, Eisenhower followed up that campaign promise to the Texas oilman by backing legislation recognizing State jurisdiction out to what they claim as their boundaries, thus overriding the Supreme Court decision which had declared the Federal interest there to be paramount.

However, those of us who wanted to reaffirm the Federal supremacy in the submerged lands and use the income for education felt we had scored a partial victory when the Senate passed the oil-for-education amendment as applied to lands beyond the State claims. But the administration still was not satisfied. It put great pressure on Republican Senators to change their stand and oppose oil-for-education so the bill as passed by the House omitting this feature would be approved.

So it was that the schoolchildren of America were not permitted to benefit even from the oil in the outer Continental Shelf, because the bill that came back from the House did not include the Hill amendment applied to the outer Continental Shelf; and, as is well known now, the conference report was adopted in the Senate by a bare majority vote of two. That majority vote was represented by two Republican votes, which were changed after White House pressure was put upon those Republicans.

When the bill was before the Senate, those Senators made perfectly clear that they were for the oil-for-education amendment, but they subsequently publicly acknowledged—or one of them, on behalf of the two, publicly acknowledged—that they had changed their position after the White House had put telephonic pressure upon them. In other words, they voted contrary to what they said were their expressed convictions.

These royalties, rents, and bonuses from mineral leases in the outer continental shelf have totaled \$294,305,090. That is the sum that our education system could have been using to teach physics, math, and history, for example, to our boys and girls, had not the White House gone to special trouble to prevent final adoption of the Hill amendment.

Recently, another chapter in the give-away has been opened. Part of the Federal income under the Outer Continental Shelf Act has been impounded, pending the outcome of a new court case in which the States have renewed their efforts to gain control out to 10½ miles. The States bordering the Gulf of Mexico have again laid claim to submerged land out to what they called their historic boundaries, even though the Supreme Court ruled against them in 1948 and 1950. The money from leases already granted in this disputed region amounts to \$113,460,587. The future income from leases in this area will amount to many times that.

The Justice Department has asked the Supreme Court to rule once more on these State claims and put an end to the issue once and for all. Initially, it asked the Court to restate its earlier decisions that no State, or even national, boundaries can extend more than 3 miles from land.

But the President has now reversed his Justice Department. Once again he stated his view in a communication to his Texas oil friend, Mr. Porter. He wrote him a letter in December, saying that it has been and still is my considered view that Texas should have the right to explore and exploit those submerged lands which extend seaward of her coastline into the Gulf of Mexico for a distance of 3 marine leagues or 10½ miles.

It is astonishing to me that Mr. Eisenhower can continue to disregard, and in fact, oppose, a ruling on this matter by the Supreme Court of the United States not only as a candidate but as President. As President, as Chief Executive, he has no higher duty than to protect and defend the interest of the American people. In fact, his Solicitor General had already appeared before the court to claim for the United States exclusive possession of and full dominion and power over the lands, minerals and other things underlying the Gulf of Mexico lying more than 3 miles from land. Yet, in a letter to his Texas oil friend and supporter H. J. Porter, the President says he is willing to have the United States Government forgo that claim. With it, the United States Government would also forgo the future income from the wealth in those lands, wealth which still might be put to the critical needs of our educational system.

Thanks to the administration's opposition to the oil-for-education amendment, \$180,844,503 out of oil revenues that might have gone into the school system have instead gone into general Treasury funds. Now, with the remaining \$113,460,587 still held in a special fund as a result of the State-Federal lawsuit, Mr. Eisenhower is taking a position that puts this amount in jeopardy of being lost entirely to the American public. What he is in fact asking the Supreme Court to do is to find different seaward boundaries for different States; he is suggesting that the court should fix the boundary of Texas at 10½ miles even though the Federal boundary is only 3 miles from land. Of course, the Supreme Court has already refused to do this.

In addition to the unreasonableness of such a determination, and in addition to his failure to press the interest of the American people, the President is demonstrating a failure to understand the importance of education in today's world.

America can no longer afford to take the position that elementary and secondary education is solely the responsibility of State and local governments. The advances in science and engineering by the Soviet Union, surpassing in many fields what we are able to accomplish, put education right up at the head of the list with all defense expenditures. Financial aid to the States from the Federal Government is, in my opinion, among the most urgent defense measures we must take.

This administration has many failures for which it must account to the people, and to the judgment of history. But none is more serious in its implications than the administration's failure to understand that the Russian sputniks are but the culmination of an education program in Russia that has been going on for at least 10 years, but which we have tried to ignore. I am deeply concerned by the administration's failure even now to understand that education in America should be supported financially by the Federal Government as a measure of national defense.

The Eisenhower record on education and oil revenues for its support which I have outlined demonstrates that these are regarded instead as points for political bargaining. Oil and money belonging to the American people have been traded for political support. That is the blunt truth of the situation.

We know how this Texas oilman, Mr. Porter, works. He made it very clear in the letter which was published in the Washington Post the other morning when he sought Republican participation in a dinner down in Texas at \$100 a plate, in order to do honor to a Republican leader he felt had been of great help to Texas.

Any Republican or Democrat has my respect when, as a matter of conviction, he takes the position which this great Republican leader has taken on the gas-and-oil question. I wish to make that perfectly clear in these remarks. However, I have no respect for the H. J. Porters. It is people like them who seek to bring undue influence to bear upon the democratic process in America for their selfish economic advantage.

It is they who, in my judgment, by what they consider to be their operations within the law, represent what amounts in fact to a course of action which can best be described as political immorality.

I happen to hold to the opinion that the activity of the President's Texas oil friend, Mr. H. J. Porter, in regard to the \$100-a-plate dinner in Texas the other night has killed the gas bill. I pray that that is true. I pray that this year, on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats alike will say, "This is just too stinking for us." There is a stench, Mr. President. The odor will not be removed by passing the \$100,000 around from one Republican campaign organization to another. The odor will

not be removed if the national committee refuses to take it, but a committee to elect Congressional candidates does take it.

We now know the kind of political game H. J. Porter plays. He had his hand deep in the mire in connection with the oil-for-education program. He has his hand deep in the mire in regard to the question of the gas bill. I am perfectly satisfied as to what the overwhelming majority of the American people will say about the situation. There is something that tells me that Members of Congress will take note of that public resentment.

Let me say, in conclusion, that this is not a thing of the past, as evidenced by the communication of the President with his Texas oil friend. It is still going on. At a time when our education needs are the greatest, the President is still intent upon giving away our best means of meeting them.

I shall continue to raise my voice against this cynical political bargaining. I shall continue to support the oil-for-education proposal, and in fact, I shall continue to work for Federal grants to the States for education. A higher standard in education is a critical defense and foreign policy need of the Nation.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if there is nothing further to come before the Senate—

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 13, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1040. An act to amend the acts known as the Life Insurance Act, approved June 19, 1934, and the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940; and

S. 2920. An act to provide for small-business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment, under the previous order, until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, February 17, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 13 (legislative day of February 10), 1958:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Donald E. Kelley, of Colorado, to be United States attorney for the district of Colorado for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires March 31, 1958.

Don A. Tabbert, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Indiana for the term of 4 years, vice Jack Chapler Brown, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Archie M. Meyer, of Arizona, to be United States marshal for the district of Arizona for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires April 2, 1958.

Tom Kimball, of Colorado, to be United States marshal for the district of Colorado for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires March 6, 1958.

Vernon Woods, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires March 6, 1958.

Roy McKinney Amos, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Indiana for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 31, 1957.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force to the grades indicated, under the provisions of sections 8306 and 8307, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Archie J. Old, Jr., 605A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Edward H. Underhill, 421A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Daniel F. Callahan, 579A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John P. McConnell, 611A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Hunter Harris, Jr., 624A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William O. Senter, 648A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William T. Hefley, 353A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. George E. Price, 475A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Donald N. Yates, 584A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Frank A. Bogart, 585A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Ernest Moore, 586A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Jacob E. Smart, 592A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joe W. Kelly, 612A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert H. Terrill, 628A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Gabriel P. Disosway, 654A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Donald P. Graul, 455A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Donald J. Keirn, 462A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Troup Miller, Jr., 559A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Alfred F. Kalberer, 607A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Romulus W. Puryear, 637A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas S. Moorman, Jr., 644A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Charles W. Schott, 949A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Benjamin J. Webster, 974A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William T. Thurman, 1034A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John B. Cary, 1055A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William M. Canterbury, 1071A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Leighton I. Davis, 1111A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James H. Walsh, 1120A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas C. Musgrave, Jr., 1129A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William T. Hudnell, 1171A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Moody R. Tidwell, Jr., 1553A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Howell M. Estes, Jr., 1211A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Richard H. Carmichael, 1214A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joseph J. Nazzaro, 1241A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John D. Stevenson, 1320A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Bruce K. Holloway, 1336A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Maurice A. Preston, 1337A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John D. Ryan, 1418A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William H. Blanchard, 1445A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Henry R. Spicer, 1487A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John S. Hardy, 1502A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. T. Alan Bennett, 1513A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James Ferguson, 1530A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. David Wade, 1582A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas P. Gerrity, 1613A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the United States Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Clyde H. Mitchell, A0263935, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Wilford F. Hall, 19026A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Brig. Gen. William L. Kennedy, 517A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James H. Wallace, 442A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Daniel C. Doubleday, 471A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles B. Dougher, 600A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Stanley T. Wray, 608A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John R. Sutherland, 617A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Albert T. Wilson, Jr., 1086A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Dolf E. Muehleisen, 1144A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles M. McCorkle, 1224A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Don O. Darrow, 1270A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Victor R. Haugen, 1292A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Sam W. Agee, 1346A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Broadhurst, 1350A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles B. Westover, 1351A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Don R. Ostrander, 1343A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Ben I. Funk, 1500A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Harold E. Watson, 1520A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Marvin C. Demler, 1550A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Henry Viccellio, 1728A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James V. Edmundson, 1863A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Charles A. Piddock, 625A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert J. Goewey, 910A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Joseph F. Delaney, 998A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Lee W. Fulton, 1107A, Regular Air Force.

Col. L. Render Braswell, 19065A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Gordon H. Austin, 1207A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William S. Steele, 1229A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John H. Jeffus, 1289A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Ivan W. McElroy, 1338A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Ernest H. Beverly, 1590A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert B. Miller, 1646A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John A. McDavid, 1652A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert E. Greer, 1672A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Perry M. Holsington 2d, 1694A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Melvin F. McNickle, 1891A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William R. Large, Jr., 1919A, Regular Air Force.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Foster B. Jones, Ashville, Ala., in place of I. E. Hodges, retired.
 Aaron Glinnie Weaver, Bay Minette, Ala., in place of C. T. Smith, retired.
 Blonnie R. Parker, Chase, Ala., in place of T. W. Naugher, retired.
 John C. Justice, Jr., Childersburg, Ala., in place of F. G. Rowland, retired.
 George S. Thomas, Eufaula, Ala., in place of L. J. Clayton, Jr., transferred.
 James E. Hughes, Jr., Geneva, Ala., in place of L. P. Adair, resigned.
 David L. Capps, Luverne, Ala., in place of W. M. Moore, retired.
 Gertrude J. McClurkin, Mount Meigs, Ala., in place of T. F. Raoul, resigned.
 Harold E. Carroll, Mulga, Ala., in place of T. W. Brock, removed.
 Woodward E. Davis, Selma, Ala., in place of C. S. Robbins, retired.
 Robert N. White, Valley Head, Ala., in place of E. A. Tatum, retired.
 John T. Davidson, Vinegar Bend, Ala., in place of J. T. Baxter, retired.
 William L. Glenn, Wetumpka, Ala., in place of Frank Poole, transferred.
 Gatewood M. Hatcher, York, Ala., in place of Maggie Winningham, retired.

ALASKA

Irene A. Begin, Aniak, Alaska, in place of Ernest Krinby, deceased.

ARKANSAS

William McKinley Huddleston, Batesville, Ark., in place of E. F. Crutchfield, transferred.
 Donald H. Travis, Judsonia, Ark., in place of W. H. Hembree, retired.
 Ruby R. Ryan, Magazine, Ark., in place of G. O. Thomasson, deceased.
 James R. McClure, Nashville, Ark., in place of J. B. Hill, deceased.
 James H. Creed, Rison, Ark., in place of J. G. Mosley, retired.
 Chester A. Garrett, State Hospital, Ark., in place of E. R. Moss, retired.
 Norman L. Wilson, Stephens, Ark., in place of F. H. Bond, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Muriel A. Graham, Bayside, Calif., in place of N. E. Johnson, retired.
 Claude B. Hetherington, Calexico, Calif., in place of J. G. Carroll, retired.
 Ellis H. Litynsky, Campbell, Calif., in place of I. H. Grim, retired.
 Fred G. Strong, Carmel, Calif., in place of F. J. Mylar, deceased.
 Darrel Lawrence Burgan, Claremont, Calif., in place of Jerome Beatty, retired.
 Robert H. Kingham, Felton, Calif., in place of O. W. Parkison, retired.
 Beulah M. Clark, Hercules, Calif., in place of A. Y. Brown, retired.
 Phillip W. Holmes, Littleriver, Calif., in place of E. F. Marks, retired.
 Wilbur H. Hartwell, Loyalton, Calif., in place of L. M. Hartwell, removed.
 Donald E. Rothrock, Mira Loma, Calif., in place of F. E. Watson, resigned.
 Robert T. Sheldon, Paradise, Calif., in place of B. L. Hunt, retired.
 Grace E. Shilling, Planada, Calif., in place of F. A. Osterhout, deceased.
 Freda H. Burgess, Rio Dell, Calif., in place of L. A. Ingraham, removed.
 Jack O. Starnes, Romoland, Calif., in place of B. E. Colahan, deceased.
 Alice E. Kitzelman, Running Springs, Calif., in place of A. M. Robertson, resigned.
 John H. Brass, Santa Maria, Calif., in place of Louis Sibillo, retired.
 Marion R. Hobbs, Soquel, Calif., in place of J. J. Mollinet, removed.
 Joseph R. Stanich, Sunnyvale, Calif., in place of H. E. Van Cleve, removed.

Silas A. Schellenger, Sutter, Calif., in place of S. R. McLean, retired.
 Robert J. Bloodgood, Twentynine Palms, Calif., in place of R. A. McWaid, resigned.
 Earl H. Chamberlain, Vacaville, Calif., in place of H. M. Talbot, retired.
 Fred W. Linneman, Watsonville, Calif., in place of F. H. Jenkins, deceased.

COLORADO

Ivan K. Clarke, Dupont, Colo., in place of S. M. Kinsall, resigned.
 Leon V. Beck, Fleming, Colo., in place of A. C. Bledsoe, transferred.
 Franklin B. Sample, New Castle, Colo., in place of C. M. Burrell, deceased.
 Clarence M. Godfrey, Walsh, Colo., in place of C. E. Raney, deceased.
 Harry B. Casten, Windsor, Colo., in place of G. A. May, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Horace Edward Leonard, Durham, Conn., in place of J. A. Jackson, removed.
 Charles W. Lindsay, Fairfield, Conn., in place of W. M. O'Dwyer, retired.
 Elsie H. Hatfield, Bear, Del., in place of H. E. Burris, deceased.

DELAWARE

Aubrey W. Pugh, Hockessin, Del., in place of C. J. Gormley, deceased.

FLORIDA

J. B. Benson, Chipley, Fla., in place of T. M. Love, resigned.

GEORGIA

James P. Burroughs, Colbert, Ga., in place of M. R. Leard, deceased.
 George T. Holloway, Midville, Ga., in place of R. H. Smith, resigned.

IDAHO

Robert H. Braithwaite, Arco, Idaho, in place of W. O. Putnam, retired.
 Edward L. Moberly, Middleton, Idaho, in place of G. E. West, retired.
 Boyd R. Moore, New Meadows, Idaho, in place of L. H. Witherspoon, retired.
 Melvin J. Snook, Orofino, Idaho, in place of Arthur Dinnison, retired.
 Floyd K. Libey, Potlatch, Idaho, in place of G. E. Van Buskirk, retired.

ILLINOIS

William F. Dettmers, Bethalto, Ill., in place of Kenneth Henkhaus, deceased.
 Ethel F. Hierman, Bluffs, Ill., in place of T. B. Meehan, removed.
 Wilbur C. Schwark, Bonfield, Ill., in place of O. C. Stehr, resigned.
 Gerard A. Marquardt, Bristol, Ill., in place of A. M. Coomes, retired.
 Leslie E. Smith, Colusa, Ill., in place of B. G. Jacobs, resigned.
 Harold G. Miller, Compton, Ill., in place of F. F. Donagh, retired.
 Roy Guy Yates, Flora, Ill., in place of J. P. McGannon, removed.
 Alice G. Woessner, Franklin Grove, Ill., in place of M. A. Howard, removed.
 Harold J. Larey, Galena, Ill., in place of W. A. Homrich, retired.
 Arnold E. Lewellen, Gilman, Ill., in place of E. P. Malone, retired.
 Walter W. Steinmann, Hamel, Ill. Office established April 1, 1956.
 Floyd S. Rollinson, Kell, Ill., in place of Lorraine Riley, transferred.
 Forest D. Slick, Kent, Ill., in place of J. E. Fox, transferred.
 John M. Albright, La Grange, Ill., in place of C. W. Farley, retired.
 Arthur Funk Lee, McLean, Ill., in place of S. A. Withrow, retired.
 Dale V. Cline, Mulberry Grove, Ill., in place of H. L. Roberts, retired.
 Cecil Moore, New Canton, Ill., in place of C. T. Gilbert, retired.
 Homer C. Lynn, Oakford, Ill., in place of Earl Allen, retired.
 Maxine S. Hayward, Olivet, Ill., in place of G. L. Hamer, removed.

Chester C. Scott, Osco, Ill., in place of G. W. Scott, retired.
 William L. Early, Penfield, Ill., in place of J. P. Early, retired.
 Arthur L. Erickson, St. Charles, Ill., in place of H. G. McCarthy, retired.
 Randall D. Page, Sesser, Ill., in place of Winsor Brayfield, deceased.
 Angus Keith Phillips, Shawneetown, Ill., in place of Basil Bennett, retired.
 Randall F. Tevis, Smithboro, Ill., in place of T. J. Marti, resigned.
 Delbert Hood, Jr., South Elgin, Ill., in place of M. L. Reinert, removed.
 Larry E. Myers, Tampico, Ill., in place of W. H. Darby, deceased.
 John A. Theodore, Urbana, Ill., in place of H. E. Bigler, resigned.
 James C. Thompson, Warsaw, Ill., in place of Esper Ziegler, retired.
 William R. Lashmet, Winchester, Ill., in place of Herbert Shibe, deceased.
 Ardelle H. Hanski, Worth, Ill., in place of D. T. Hanski, deceased.
 Thomas B. Malone, Wyoming, Ill., in place of K. L. Colwell, retired.
 Russell C. Spice, Zion, Ill., in place of H. G. Ingram, retired.

INDIANA

Charles E. Sweany, Crothersville, Ind., in place of H. B. Fultz, retired.
 Charles L. Oxley, Evansville, Ind., in place of J. E. Sachs, deceased.
 Twanette S. Coleman, Forest, Ind., in place of V. F. Webster, retired.
 Don Hubert Neff, Goshen, Ind., in place of L. Y. Cripe, retired.
 Gerald B. Eitner, Hillsboro, Ind., in place of A. E. Lighty, Jr., removed.
 Paul H. Miller, Macy, Ind., in place of S. S. Foor, retired.
 Russell F. Berkheiser, Ossian, Ind., in place of S. C. Hilsmer, retired.
 Max I. Ward, Spencer, Ind., in place of Golden High, retired.

IOWA

Lloyd L. Giltner, Agency, Iowa, in place of T. J. Leinhauser, retired.
 Bernard H. Richter, Ashton, Iowa, in place of H. S. King, retired.
 Paul E. Sanderson, Beaman, Iowa, in place of B. H. Rowe, retired.
 Roger M. Galloway, Cedar Falls, Iowa, in place of L. H. Hughes, retired.
 Paul E. Garthwaite, Charles City, Iowa, in place of B. F. Welsh, deceased.
 Paul F. Hoyt, Cherokee, Iowa, in place of W. H. Fishman, retired.
 John R. Johnson, Mallard, Iowa, in place of Sophia Hood, retired.
 John H. Pazour, Marion, Iowa, in place of C. D. Burns, retired.
 Thelma C. Voss, Marne, Iowa, in place of William North, deceased.
 James C. Houle, Mechanicsville, Iowa, in place of F. G. Ferguson, retired.
 Benjamin P. Flack, Jr., Osage, Iowa, in place of L. F. McGrane, retired.
 James L. Brown, Peterson, Iowa, in place of R. W. Reed, transferred.
 Helen T. Kernen, Ralston, Iowa, in place of M. S. Copenhaver, retired.
 Eugene F. Watters, Sanborn, Iowa, in place of E. W. Wayne, deceased.
 Norman O. Walk, South English, Iowa, in place of J. F. White, retired.

KANSAS

Thomas L. Kauble, Arcadia, Kans., in place of G. J. Roeback, retired.
 Francis W. Johnson, Argonia, Kans., in place of Etta Le Ford, retired.
 Gene C. Montgomery, Barnard, Kans., in place of E. A. King, transferred.
 William L. Pool, Bronson, Kans., in place of L. W. Love, resigned.
 Harold T. Stodard, Burlingame, Kans., in place of H. M. McCauley, retired.
 Emmett E. Sutherland, Galena, Kans., in place of J. O. Derfelt, retired.

Melvin H. Besancon, Lancaster, Kans., in place of E. N. Coleman, resigned.
 Ray D. Wiley, Lyndon, Kans., in place of W. J. Gray, transferred.
 Chalmers A. Hawks, Nickerson, Kans., in place of F. J. Lehman, retired.
 Harlin L. Hornbostel, Palmer, Kans., in place of F. M. Martin, deceased.
 Samuel P. Bell, Scranton, Kans., in place of Elizabeth Brackman, retired.
 Edward A. Fink, Stilwell, Kans., in place of H. C. Cave, resigned.

KENTUCKY

William H. Burgess, Arlington, Ky., in place of Z. G. Neville, retired.
 Lissa H. Tarter, Campbellsburg, Ky., in place of R. L. Kerr, resigned.
 William D. Gorman, Hazard, Ky., in place of A. M. Moore, retired.
 Jacob H. Weller, Owensboro, Ky., in place of S. B. Smith, retired.
 Charles B. Neville, Park City, Ky., in place of R. E. Doyle, removed.
 Garrett L. Robey, Stamping Ground, Ky., in place of H. H. Clark, transferred.
 D. Hess Vest, Walton, Ky., in place of C. F. Cleek, resigned.
 Julian B. Hays, Woodburn, Ky., in place of L. W. Hobbs, retired.

LOUISIANA

Doris L. Hebert, Baldwin, La., in place of E. B. Martin, resigned.
 Samuel D. Castleberry, Ferriday, La., in place of N. J. Browne, resigned.
 Louise M. Townsend, Gilbert, La., in place of A. B. Griffin, retired.
 Olive J. DeJean, Hodge, La., in place of E. A. McDowell, retired.
 Johnnie H. Mitcham, Leesville, La., in place of LeRoy Ford, retired.
 Andrew H. Ferguson, Marion, La., in place of M. K. Roark, retired.
 Wanza G. Keaton, Tangipahoa, La., in place of V. C. Kent, retired.

MAINE

Frances C. Sands, Bar Mills, Maine, in place of L. G. Sands, retired.
 Gerald B. Guay, Bingham, Maine, in place of H. C. Collins, deceased.
 Eleanor B. Foster, China, Maine, in place of J. H. Wentworth, retired.
 Marshall F. Holmes, Jefferson, Maine, in place of H. G. Hoffes, retired.
 Hubert A. Cowan, Newcastle, Maine, in place of L. L. Guptill, retired.
 Richard A. Smith, Northeast Harbor, Maine, in place of E. C. Davis, deceased.
 Ralph A. MacDonald, South Windham, Maine, in place of L. H. Bromley, retired.

MARYLAND

Hester S. Duff, Earleville, Md., in place of E. D. Loller, retired.
 Robert Joseph Sellner, Jessup, Md., in place of G. C. Kirn, deceased.
 Reba C. Warner, Lisbon, Md., in place of J. L. Donovan, removed.
 Eliot W. Sperry, Lutherville-Timonium, Md., in place of G. H. Johnston, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

Althea M. F. Staples, Brant Rock, Mass., in place of M. L. Fletcher, deceased.
 Ernest A. Whitman, Centerville, Mass., in place of J. J. Pendergast, resigned.
 Arthur Edison Coakley, East Brewster, Mass., in place of M. L. Foster, retired.
 James J. Gallagher, Lowell, Mass., in place of C. H. Slowe, retired.
 Edward H. Morse, Mansfield, Mass., in place of J. E. Bellew, retired.
 Frank E. Dudley, Mendon, Mass., in place of Mabel Griffin, deceased.
 Margaret T. Baader, North Bellingham, Mass., in place of E. T. Camp, retired.
 Burton S. Young, Orleans, Mass., in place of J. D. Anthony, retired.
 William T. Bowden, Wales, Mass., in place of R. H. Lancaster, retired.

Samuel James Currie, Whitinsville, Mass., in place of W. F. McDonald, retired.

MICHIGAN

William Z. Todd, Allen, Mich., in place of Emma Keating, retired.
 Jack D. Dickhout, Boyne City, Mich., in place of Roy Winegarden, retired.
 Victor J. Haughey, Camden, Mich., in place of F. J. Brown, deceased.
 Olen O. Smith, Crystal, Mich., in place of J. D. George, retired.
 George A. Martin, Dearborn, Mich., in place of J. A. Yagley, retired.
 Thomas J. Butler, Emmett, Mich., in place of Elmer Brogan, retired.
 Elizabeth E. Ospring, Grand Junction, Mich., in place of P. E. Bolin, retired.
 Sayre H. Ostrander, Grand Marais, Mich., in place of E. L. Mulligan, retired.
 Neil G. Kalmbach, Grass Lake, Mich., in place of Olaf Christensen, retired.
 Frank E. Kline, Jones, Mich., in place of J. B. Seidl, resigned.
 Frank M. Townsend, Marcellus, Mich., in place of H. D. Sweet, retired.
 Harold L. Hande, Mattawan, Mich., in place of Marguerite Ryan, resigned.
 James L. Collins, Milan, Mich., in place of L. A. Butler, retired.
 Robert G. Brown, Monroe, Mich., in place of A. C. Maurer, retired.
 Leonard L. Swanson, Muir, Mich., in place of Coral Estep, deceased.
 Edmund B. Suleki, Napoleon, Mich., in place of Blanche McGraw, retired.
 Leo G. Smith, Newberry, Mich., in place of Joseph Villemure, retired.
 Ernest R. Steen, Shelby, Mich., in place of R. R. Royal, retired.
 Stewart E. Walter, Smiths Creek, Mich., in place of A. F. Lenart, retired.
 Orrin B. Powell, Stockbridge, Mich., in place of E. E. Lehman, transferred.
 Edward O. Perket, Traverse City, Mich., in place of H. B. Whitson, retired.

MINNESOTA

Norton M. Sorenson, Amboy, Minn., in place of A. R. Wilder, retired.
 Orvind P. Nichols, Borup, Minn., in place of E. O. Benthagen, retired.
 Donna J. Gross, Calumet, Minn., in place of P. F. Preice, retired.
 Dorothy R. Johnson, Gheen, Minn., in place of S. E. Brooker, retired.
 Howard C. Eichhorn, Hill City, Minn., in place of Zephia Taylor, retired.
 Delmer J. Larson, Hills, Minn., in place of E. M. Schellhouse, retired.
 Herbert M. Koster, Pequot Lakes, Minn., in place of H. E. Bye, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI

Bester L. Files, Ackerman, Miss., in place of E. M. Commander, retired.
 Andy J. Becker, Bay St. Louis, Miss., in place of F. L. Herlihy, retired.
 Calvin J. Meaders, Hickory, Miss., in place of E. M. Henton, retired.
 Dan C. McNeill, McNeill, Miss., in place of J. G. Dexter, retired.
 John T. Miller, Myrtle, Miss., in place of H. P. Megginson, transferred.
 Fred D. Rogers, Nettleton, Miss., in place of J. C. Young, transferred.
 Ola L. McMath, Sidon, Miss., in place of J. S. Defoore, retired.

MISSOURI

Russell E. Ray, Adrian, Mo., in place of D. L. Davis, transferred.
 Doyle L. Scott, Armstrong, Mo., in place of E. W. Mott, retired.
 Stanley H. Jarvis, Belgrade, Mo., in place of Belva Maxwell, retired.
 Bernice W. Holloway, Bragg City, Mo., in place of R. H. Hogue, Sr., retired.
 James R. McKnight, Calhoun, Mo., in place of M. R. Fewel, retired.
 Charles A. Barron, Clarksville, Mo., in place of K. C. Patton, retired.

Donnell E. Carey, Dawn, Mo., in place of Mabel Cunningham, retired.
 Don M. Anderson, Dixon, Mo., in place of J. D. Elkins, deceased.
 Harry L. Hibbard, Gilliam, Mo., in place of J. P. Payne, retired.
 Everette A. Westfall, Higbee, Mo., in place of G. M. Lenhart, resigned.
 Robert H. Horine, Norborne, Mo., in place of M. G. Kenton, retired.
 Robert L. Moseley, Rothville, Mo., in place of M. E. Vassar, resigned.
 Genoa E. Williams, Seligman, Mo., in place of B. P. Mitchell, retired.
 Harry H. Forman, Shelbyville, Mo., in place of L. A. Kaylor, deceased.
 Sylvester H. Brinker, Villa Ridge, Mo., in place of R. W. Disharoon, retired.
 Hobert W. Hunt, Wheatland, Mo., in place of C. E. Kleck, retired.

MONTANA

Willard W. Wilde, Bainville, Mont., in place of A. C. Coulston, deceased.
 Amelia E. Gerds, Garrison, Mont., in place of W. W. Welch, removed.
 Walter R. Richards, Hall, Mont., in place of F. M. Morse, retired.
 Frank F. Pisk, Terry, Mont., in place of G. L. Buckingham, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Ralph E. Skillman, Ainsworth, Nebr., in place of Salem Abraham, retired.
 Mildred M. Heikes, Dakota City, Nebr., in place of H. C. Paquin, retired.
 George A. Fenske, Jr., Dunbar, Nebr., in place of H. H. Ottens, transferred.
 Bryce E. Heckman, Hickman, Nebr., in place of Samuel Broekema, retired.
 Wilmer G. Tollefsen, Kearney, Nebr., in place of J. W. Boyd, resigned.
 Sheldon B. Mitchell, Nehawka, Nebr., in place of D. E. Waldo, resigned.
 Quintin L. Nicholas, Palmer, Nebr., in place of Lafe Simonson, retired.
 Donald C. Gillham, Sidney, Nebr., in place of D. R. Shipman, removed.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Edwin F. Locke, Amherst, N. H., in place of V. P. Brine, retired.
 David R. Elder, Dublin, N. H., in place of W. E. French, retired.
 Philip M. Clark, Marlboro, N. H., in place of A. A. Croteau, retired.
 Allan H. MacDougall, Milan, N. H., in place of T. N. Taylor, retired.
 Josephine B. Larson, Newbury, N. H., in place of G. T. Berglund, resigned.
 Arthur J. Denault, Plaistow, N. H., in place of H. W. Ladd, retired.
 Leroy F. Barnhart, Wentworth, N. H., in place of B. W. Ray, resigned.
 William F. Haskell, Wilnot Flat, N. H., in place of F. R. Cutler, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

George M. Durso, Fort Lee, N. J., in place of D. A. Skelley, retired.
 Leslie J. Sherwood, Haworth, N. J., in place of B. W. Shaw, resigned.
 Timothy J. Flynn, Livingston, N. J., in place of W. M. Carner, retired.
 Guido V. Marsocci, Osbornville, N. J., in place of G. T. Osborn, retired.
 Frank Magill, Jr., Pompton Lakes, N. J., in place of J. V. R. Nichol, retired.

NEW MEXICO

Clyde B. Lee, Gallup, N. Mex., in place of Dominic Rolle, deceased.
 Sibyl S. Griffin, Reserve, N. Mex., in place of Irene Graham, resigned.

NEW YORK

Leighton C. Austin, Alfred Station, N. Y., in place of L. W. Palmiter, transferred.
 Merritt Pember Newberry, Canastota, N. Y., in place of L. J. Williams, deceased.
 Ralph Seaman Lansing, Castleton on Hudson, N. Y., in place of R. C. Kilmer, resigned.

Clarence H. Taber, Cato, N. Y., in place of D. J. Herrington, retired.

Frederick L. Gifford, Clifton Springs, N. Y., in place of K. G. Bement, retired.

Hampton B. Scofield, Cold Spring, N. Y., in place of B. W. Schatzle, resigned.

Clifford S. Kloos, Crown Point, N. Y., in place of H. S. Peck, retired.

Paul E. Wamp, Jr., Dansville, N. Y., in place of C. C. Curry, retired.

Wallace M. Whitley, Ellisburg, N. Y., in place of James Dick, removed.

Gordon Raymond Shepardson, Elmira, N. Y., in place of C. J. O'Connell, retired.

James George Dougall, Evans Mills, N. Y., in place of I. H. Cryslar, retired.

Heber Ashley, Jr., Grand Island, N. Y., in place of E. T. Sheehan, resigned.

Ella B. Siemerling, Granite Springs, N. Y., in place of C. F. Klingenstein, deceased.

Lillian E. Call, Great Bend, N. Y., in place of M. M. Humes, retired.

Anthony J. Wirmusky, Hoosick Falls, N. Y., in place of H. V. Allen, retired.

Joseph F. Clark, Hughsonville, N. Y., in place of Fred Churchill, retired.

Harriet M. Cole, Hurleyville, N. Y., in place of W. H. Toohey, deceased.

Everett W. Mussen, Keeseville, N. Y., in place of E. A. Laundree, deceased.

Nicholas W. Toborg, Leeds, N. Y., in place of J. G. Winans, retired.

Daniel J. Millicker, Mahopac Falls, N. Y., in place of G. W. Millicker, deceased.

Ronald T. Murphy, Napanoch, N. Y., in place of F. D. Hurd, retired.

Anna L. Butcher, North Chili, N. Y., in place of M. L. McNees, resigned.

Frank LaVigne, Ogdensburg, N. Y., in place of A. G. McLellan, removed.

James Norton Engleson, Ontario, N. Y., in place of E. E. Casey, retired.

Harrison M. Fairbanks, Portville, N. Y., in place of J. F. Cronin, retired.

George A. Gutterson, Rensselaer Falls, N. Y., in place of M. L. Jenkins, retired.

Florence R. Buckley, Rosendale, N. Y., in place of Marie Lamb, resigned.

James Joseph Barry, St. James, N. Y., in place of T. V. Sullivan, removed.

Robert L. Bower, Sanborn, N. Y., in place of W. H. Kline, resigned.

George J. F. Secor, Scarborough, N. Y., in place of G. O. Fountain, retired.

Nina B. Dickerson, Sheiter Island, N. Y., in place of A. A. Sherman, retired.

Roy G. Peterson, Southampton, N. Y., in place of E. W. Wolf, retired.

Harvie Coleman, Summitville, N. Y., in place of W. C. Budd, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Carlyle P. Matheson, Andrews, N. C., in place of Galusha Pulliam, removed.

James R. Frady, Candler, N. C., in place of B. E. Brenton, resigned.

John H. Hufton, Creswell, N. C., in place of E. S. Woodley, deceased.

Clifton W. Crispe, Cullowhee, N. C., in place of B. B. Long, retired.

William B. Mayhew, Davidson, N. C., in place of S. T. Stough, deceased.

Clemmie E. Norris, East Spencer, N. C., in place of M. T. Mason, retired.

John L. Pippin, Fremont, N. C., in place of C. G. Pike, deceased.

James E. Stack, Harmony, N. C., in place of Ovid Pullen, retired.

Ruth T. Smith, Havelock, N. C. Office established January 1, 1957.

Junius W. Rogers, Jr., Henderson, N. C., in place of W. C. Stainback, retired.

Carl L. Talley, Highlands, N. C., in place of C. C. Potts, retired.

Frank Conder, Jr., Indian Trail, N. C., in place of H. M. Orr, retired.

James F. Inman, Laurinburg, N. C., in place of H. M. McArn, retired.

Norman A. Randall, Leicester, N. C., in place of M. H. Current, retired.

Franklin R. Frisby, Marshall, N. C., in place of Grace Freeman, retired.

Azer Dow Baucom, Sr., Monroe, N. C., in place of S. H. Lee, resigned.

Robert Kelly Montague, Newport, N. C., in place of L. A. Mann, retired.

Charles C. Small, Sophia, N. C., in place of D. R. Bulla, retired.

Lloyd J. Parrish, Swansboro, N. C., in place of R. E. Stanley, removed.

NORTH DAKOTA

Donald G. Paul, Arthur, N. Dak., in place of E. B. Scott, retired.

Edward J. Ziman, Dodge, N. Dak., in place of M. E. Goetz, deceased.

OHIO

Robert N. Croskey, Amsterdam, Ohio, in place of L. M. Helphinstine, retired.

Paul R. Day, Atwater, Ohio, in place of E. C. Hillyer, retired.

Arthur E. Hill, Batavia, Ohio, in place of C. S. Coyle, deceased.

James F. Braig, Buckeye Lake, Ohio, in place of K. W. Lowrey, removed.

Carl I. Moser, Cridersville, Ohio, in place of Fred Reichelderfer, retired.

John W. Watson, Deshler, Ohio, in place of T. B. King, retired.

Paul L. Burkholder, Edon, Ohio, in place of P. W. Burkhardt, retired.

Martin Marshall Miller, Franklin, Ohio, in place of H. E. Mills, transferred.

Ralph J. Huff, Fredericktown, Ohio, in place of W. M. Doll, retired.

Paul L. Sailor, Jackson Center, Ohio, in place of R. E. Elliott, transferred.

Ralph Eugene Bresbach, Kingston, Ohio, in place of A. D. Etter, transferred.

Edward Seymour Ullum, Lebanon, Ohio, in place of C. S. Earnhart, retired.

Luster M. Barlow, Liberty Center, Ohio, in place of P. L. Seitz, deceased.

Howard M. Lawrence, Long Bottom, Ohio, in place of C. C. Marcinko, transferred.

Frances M. DeFosset, Loveland, Ohio, in place of R. V. Tracy, resigned.

Harold Ralph Thompson, McDermott, Ohio, in place of W. R. Shaw, deceased.

John B. Gibbs, Midvale, Ohio, in place of D. F. Dinger, deceased.

John B. Carr, Jr., Monclova, Ohio, in place of C. F. Metzger, retired.

S. Eleanor N. Cope, Neffs, Ohio, in place of R. E. Jackson, deceased.

Estella E. Ford, New Weston, Ohio, in place of J. E. Singleman, transferred.

Lilla M. McAfee, Owensville, Ohio, in place of C. A. Fetter, retired.

Luther L. Burnett, Patriot, Ohio, in place of Alice Clark, retired.

Raymond L. Brooks, Plymouth, Ohio, in place of C. E. Sourwine, retired.

Margaret A. Stanford, Randolph, Ohio, in place of M. F. North, removed.

Philip Milton Tozzer, Ross, Ohio, in place of J. C. Guard, retired.

Dale L. McDonald, Rushville, Ohio, in place of H. E. Morehead, retired.

John L. Zimmerman, Seaman, Ohio, in place of T. F. Short, retired.

Lester L. Stearns, Sherrodsville, Ohio, in place of C. A. Belknap, transferred.

Ray D. Hall, St. Clairsville, Ohio, in place of D. S. Shia, resigned.

Thomas A. Brayshaw, Tipp City, Ohio, in place of C. N. Wenzlau, retired.

Kathryn B. Thomas, Valley City, Ohio, in place of E. E. Arick, retired.

Helen L. Pratt, Woodstock, Ohio, in place of P. B. Hildreth, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Thomas H. Henderson, Fort Cobb, Okla., in place of W. S. Bird, transferred.

Walter G. Enfield, Jefferson, Okla., in place of L. M. Amick, retired.

James G. Maddox, Ponca City, Okla., in place of P. S. Badami, deceased.

OREGON

Ivan A. Olsen, Madras, Oreg., in place of G. W. Dee, removed.

Harley D. Naas, Myrtle Creek, Oreg., in place of Bryan Dieckman, transferred.

Irvin Lewis Wence, North Plains, Oreg., in place of G. R. Sandford, removed.

Bernice I. White, Parkdale, Oreg., in place of A. L. Boe, retired.

Joseph D. McKay, St. Paul, Oreg., in place of G. P. Connor, Jr., resigned.

Ruby A. Keller, Vida, Oreg., in place of W. C. Keller, deceased.

John L. Shetterly, Willamina, Oreg., in place of Esther Fawc, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Eugene Linton Sohn, Ambridge, Pa., in place of C. W. Goerman, deceased.

Francis C. Uffelman, Bakerstown, Pa., in place of C. W. Heckert, retired.

Walter H. Grier, Sr., Beaver Brook, Pa., in place of J. D. McNelis, retired.

Thomas G. Nestor, Brownfield, Pa., in place of R. G. Shaw, resigned.

Don A. Ducoeur, Charleroi, Pa., in place of G. H. Smith, retired.

Vida C. Rodham, Chinchilla, Pa., in place of J. J. Habeeb, resigned.

John G. Davidson, Christiana, Pa., in place of W. E. Russell, retired.

Albert Thomas, Clarksburg, Pa., in place of D. M. Henry, removed.

James George Lindsay, Cochranville, Pa., in place of T. C. Ferron, retired.

George D. Headrick, Colver, Pa., in place of D. C. Feighner, retired.

Ethel J. Nelson, Cooperstown, Pa., in place of E. K. McDaniel, deceased.

James H. Hulak, Danboro, Pa., in place of S. S. Myers, resigned.

Walter J. Alphin, Douglassville, Pa., in place of M. R. Becker, retired.

Mae A. Kester, East Texas, Pa., in place of G. V. Butz, deceased.

Robert A. Bushyeager, Girard, Pa., in place of R. F. Rick, retired.

French Cason, Sr., Greensburg, Pa., in place of M. M. Hughes, removed.

Robert L. Allen, Grove City, Pa., in place of G. C. Bower, deceased.

Victor R. Alderfer, Harleysville, Pa., in place of W. E. Schissler, resigned.

William J. Stivison, Homer City, Pa., in place of J. L. Kinter, retired.

Edmund B. Hebrank, Jeannette, Pa., in place of R. M. Hoffman, resigned.

John W. Aungst, Jr., Landisville, Pa., in place of J. H. Grube, deceased.

Bertye A. Boorse, Montgomeryville, Pa., in place of J. E. Chapman, retired.

Nellie A. Fish, Nelson, Pa., in place of N. M. Leonard, retired.

Marion J. Brown, Oxford, Pa., in place of R. C. Moore, resigned.

Everett Willard Anderson, Port Allegany, Pa., in place of M. C. Teater, retired.

Orpha G. Leitzel, Richfield, Pa., in place of J. H. Snyder, resigned.

George F. Yedlicka, Rillton, Pa., in place of D. H. Baughman, retired.

John M. Fox, Shanksville, Pa., in place of G. J. Allen, removed.

Reno Lincoln Mosier, Jr., Smock, Pa., in place of Bessie Havlichek, retired.

James W. Sullivan, Snow Shoe, Pa., in place of J. M. Gilliland, retired.

Horace S. Glover, Starrucca, Pa., in place of G. E. Carpenter, resigned.

Paul Eugene Ribble, Stillwater, Pa., in place of H. M. Smith, resigned.

Edgar S. Babb, Tatamy, Pa., in place of E. S. Happel, retired.

Charles W. Snyder, Thomasville, Pa., in place of C. D. Witman, retired.

Sophie D. Scipione, Tire Hill, Pa., in place of Pauline Strozak, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John C. Jutt, director, Lithuanian affairs, Knights of Lithuania, Worcester, Mass., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

O Almighty and Eternal God, ever present before us, we adore Thee as our creator and sovereign master and we give Thee thanks for the innumerable blessings of freedom which Thou hast given us.

O Heavenly Father, source of all authority, we humbly beg Thee to look down with paternal solicitude upon these Thy servants, the Members of this august body, the House of Representatives of the United States. Grant them, in whom Thou hast placed Thy authority, the wisdom by which, fortified in their deliberations by the inspirations of the Holy Spirit, they may be the constructive influences for the preservation of peace among those whom they represent and for the attainment of peace by those who unjustly are being denied it.

O Eternal Father, source of all freedom, regard with benign favor the sufferings and the hardships of the people of Lithuania. Please hear our prayer that precious freedom, to which all nations have an inalienable right and which comes to nations living in harmony and friendliness, may soon come once again to her. Through Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 10, 1958, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that, on the following dates, the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On February 11, 1958:

H. R. 5938. An act to amend section 812 (e) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain decedents who were adjudged incompetent before April 2, 1948;

H. R. 7762. An act to amend section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950 so that it will apply to taxable years ending in 1954 to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies;

H. R. 8216. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent unjust enrichment by precluding refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes to persons who have not borne the ultimate burden of the tax;

H. R. 8865. An act relating to the administration of certain collected taxes;

H. R. 9035. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of stock acquired by the exercise of restricted stock options after the death of the employee; and

H. R. 10146. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

Richard Edwin Snell, Towanda, Pa., in place of Rosanna McGee, retired.

Noah W. Nase, Tylersport, Pa., in place of M. K. Leister, resigned.

Richard E. Sayres, Willow Street, Pa., in place of Florence Layman, deceased.

PUERTO RICO

Oscar Rios Santiago, Corozal, P. R., in place of A. M. Bou, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Charles A. Evans, Anderson, S. C., in place of R. H. Gaines, retired.

Sallie M. Hollins, Beaufort, S. C., in place of L. A. Hall, retired.

Daniel M. McCaskill, Camden, S. C., in place of Benton Sheorn, deceased.

Joe H. Giltner, Jr., Chester, S. C., in place of C. C. Wilkes, retired.

James B. Miles, Coward, S. C., in place of T. J. Lynch, deceased.

Lou Ann Wilder, Hemingway, S. C., in place of W. T. Hemingway, retired.

Robert Morris Clayton, Laurens, S. C., in place of M. J. Simpson, retired.

Robert W. Rutland, Rion, S. C., in place of A. M. Blair, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Milton H. Collmann, Isabel, S. Dak., in place of M. J. Matthews, retired.

Fred H. Knudsen, Viborg, S. Dak., in place of C. A. Hattervig, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Charles B. Gray, Afton, Tenn., in place of R. V. Earnest, retired.

Harold N. Tidwell, Bon Aqua, Tenn., in place of A. J. Frazier, resigned.

Elmer J. Atkinson, Clarkrange, Tenn., in place of E. M. Peters, retired.

Opal B. Wilkinson, Fayetteville, Tenn., in place of R. F. Buchanan, retired.

Keith L. Patterson, Friendsville, Tenn., in place of C. K. McDowell, resigned.

Eugene S. Mitchell, Limestone, Tenn., in place of H. B. Gillespie, retired.

Thomas Harold Wilson, Madison, Tenn., in place of D. I. Huggins, resigned.

William Hal Redmond, Maury City, Tenn., in place of H. B. Riddick, retired.

Erma J. Hall, Mayland, Tenn., in place of E. L. Phillips, resigned.

John C. Hamilton, Pikeville, Tenn., in place of Cecil Hitchcox, transferred.

TEXAS

Jake Fortenberry, Adrian, Tex., in place of A. J. Witt, resigned.

Gwynn A. Boswell, Athens, Tex., in place of E. M. Jackson, transferred.

Jean M. Barnhart, Cactus, Tex., in place of L. G. Cleveland, resigned.

Thomas D. McManus, Channelview, Tex., in place of L. L. Bradley, Sr., deceased.

James Ray Moore, Clarendon, Tex., in place of J. C. Estlack, retired.

D. L. Stoker, Jr., Crowley, Tex., in place of R. H. Chapman, retired.

Frances M. Harvey, Fort Davis, Tex., in place of J. W. Kemp, removed.

Etta L. Chamberlain, Goree, Tex., in place of C. R. Chamberlain, deceased.

Lloyd V. Keller, Lacoste, Tex., in place of A. E. Jungmann, retired.

Darrell R. Sherman, Leander, Tex., in place of J. S. Cluck, resigned.

Billy Wayne Newman, Moody, Tex., in place of C. C. Canuteson, retired.

James M. Sullins, Oglesby, Tex., in place of James Everett, Jr., transferred.

Homer B. Copeland, Palmer, Tex., in place of H. M. Culpepper, retired.

Helen R. Biggerstaff, Pierce, Tex., in place of E. D. Farmer, retired.

Carl F. Baumgartner, Refugio, Tex., in place of G. E. Warren, deceased.

William A. Farek, Schulenburg, Tex., in place of F. L. Herzik, retired.

Jake R. Demere, Sierra Blanca, Tex., in place of G. C. Stephens, retired.

Ila B. Hulme, Stowell, Tex., in place of Ethel Miller, retired.

Vivian L. McElligott, Terminal, Tex., in place of B. J. Beene, resigned.

William H. Summers, Trenton, Tex., in place of W. J. Huff, retired.

Horace M. Camp, Whitney, Tex., in place of M. E. Herrington, transferred.

UTAH

Rulon S. Wood, Cedar City, Utah, in place of G. L. Janson, retired.

VERMONT

James M. McCabe, Arlington, Vt., in place of I. M. Vaughn, retired.

Sadie R. Hamilton, Cuttingsville, Vt., in place of D. M. Stewart, deceased.

Raymond A. Petelle, Derby Line, Vt., in place of A. A. LaFrance, deceased.

Lawrence H. Riggs, Hinesburg, Vt., in place of M. C. McKenzie, retired.

VIRGINIA

James R. McLearn, Herndon, Va., in place of S. F. Hutchinson, retired.

James L. Kinzie, Troutville, Va., in place of E. L. Boone, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Harrison H. Holmes, Cosmopolis, Wash., in place of E. M. Davis, retired.

Lawrence B. Howe, Enumclaw, Wash., in place of W. A. Gross, retired.

Ione M. Jurgens, Kahlotus, Wash., in place of A. E. Buchanan, retired.

Hazel L. Buckingham, Mansfield, Wash., in place of M. M. Ward, retired.

Lawrence A. Winn, Oakesdale, Wash., in place of W. L. McClure, retired.

Randall L. Stroud, Puyallup, Wash., in place of Andrew Hunter, retired.

Joseph Everett Reed, Selah, Wash., in place of L. H. Saur, retired.

Harvey L. Jones, Tacoma, Wash., in place of G. P. Fishburne, retired.

Leslie J. Marsh, Wilkeson, Wash., in place of D. B. Hreha, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Rex A. Pygman, Huntington, W. Va., in place of Roy Lewis, resigned.

Thomas C. Booth, Littleton, W. Va., in place of Arthur Jackson, retired.

WISCONSIN

Francis H. Sumnicht, Appleton, Wis., in place of S. D. Balliet, retired.

Golden M. Barritt, Barron, Wis., in place of C. R. Lawton, deceased.

Arthur E. Reid, Boscobel, Wis., in place of M. P. Tierney, deceased.

Robert E. Dietrich, Cassville, Wis., in place of F. H. Kartman, transferred.

Lucille M. Radtke, Embarrass, Wis., in place of K. F. Baker, deceased.

Donald C. Swanson, Lakewood, Wis., in place of L. H. Hardebeck, retired.

Elmer E. Bressler, Menomonie, Wis., in place of C. V. Porter, retired.

Carl F. John, Montello, Wis., in place of C. J. McAfee, removed.

Arthur E. Rafferty, Mountain, Wis., in place of A. L. Olson, retired.

Ellen M. Schmidt, Newton, Wis., in place of H. H. Eberhardt, retired.

Harold A. Wendt, Owen, Wis., in place of R. C. Graham, retired.

Ruben G. Duchow, Potter, Wis., in place of O. A. Kasper, deceased.

Valentine H. Habel, Ripon, Wis., in place of W. J. Amend, deceased.

Vaughn W. Biles, Stockholm, Wis., in place of M. E. Johnson, deceased.

Leroy H. Graves, Sullivan, Wis., in place of K. G. Lynch, retired.

Marcella M. Wilke, Zachow, Wis., in place of W. J. Kreil, failed to return from military duty.

On February 12, 1958:

H. R. 9739. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 533. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1958, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION, 1959

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday, February 14, to file a report on the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1959.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN reserved all points of order on the bill.

MARGIE C. STEWART

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 266) for the relief of Margie C. Stewart, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is hereby requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 8038), for the relief of Margie C. Stewart; that if and when such bill is returned by the President, the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the President of the Senate in signing such bill is hereby rescinded; and that the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of such bill to make the following changes: On page 1, line 9 of the House engrossed bill, strike out "such compensation to be paid at the rate received on the date of removal less any amounts earned by her through other employment during such period or paid to her as unemployment compensation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION, FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1957— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, together with the accompanying papers, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of

the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 13, 1958.

AMENDING THE NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include certain resolutions regarding H. R. 6790 and H. R. 6791, amending the Natural Gas Act, and that the Speaker refer these resolutions to the proper committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, I have received a great deal of mail in opposition to the bills, H. R. 6790 and H. R. 6791, which proposes to amend the Natural Gas Act.

Included in the opposition to this proposed legislation are three resolutions from cities in my district.

One is Resolution 9236, adopted by the Council of the City of Hamilton, Ohio, on February 5, 1958.

The second is an informal resolution adopted by the City Commission of the City of Dayton, Ohio, on January 29, 1958.

The third is Resolution 635, adopted by the Council of the City of Miamisburg, Ohio, on February 4, 1958.

I ask that you receive these resolutions and refer them to the proper committee.

THE WITNESS OF THE PAST, THE IN- STRUCTOR OF THE PRESENT, AND THE MONITOR TO THE FUTURE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that February 9 through the 16th is Negro History Week. The second week of February has been observed as such in many communities throughout the United States since 1926 when the late historian, Carter G. Woodson, persuaded the Nation that the significant accomplishments of the Negro in all areas of our American culture should be more widely recognized.

Observance of Negro History Week is not designed to lend assistance to those who would rip the national social structure apart in slivers of ethnic groups, each competing with the other in worship of its own heroes. Its purpose is to serve as a device to inform all Americans of far too little known contributions of American Negroes to the Nation's past.

These contributions are not solely represented by famous names now a part of the great American characteristic of accomplishment in spite of handicaps—Benjamin Banneker, Frederick Douglass, Booker T. Washington, George Washing-

ton Carver—names with which all of us are familiar. Just as important are the more subtle contributions which have been so interwoven into the fabric of our national patterns that they are identified the world over as "American," such as our music, our dance.

During Negro History Week this year, February 14 has been set aside as Proud American Day, so designated by the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History. The association has set two goals for this day: First, it hopes to stimulate pride in the great American heritage of all our people; and, secondly, to reiterate the examples of American Negroes of history who overcome far greater difficulties than exist today to make their considerable contributions. The emphasis here is on responsibilities of citizenship and the enlightenment of all our youth toward understanding their heritage. Knowledge is needed to replace ignorance and prejudice, and the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History is to be commended for its role as "the witness of the past, the instructor of the present, and the monitor to the future."

HISTORY OF THE ANTHRACITE COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week we celebrated the 150th birthday of the anthracite coal industry to the first burning of anthracite coal in a grate. All of the wonders of our modern technological age could never have been achieved without coal, and for many, many years, it was anthracite coal that was king.

There is a tradition that between 1750 and 1755 there were a few Indians near Nazareth, Pa., who knew that anthracite or stone coal would burn.

It was in the Wyoming region that white men first discovered anthracite in 1762. In that year, Parshall Terry and a company of Connecticut pioneers found coal on the banks of the Susquehanna River, near the present city of Wilkes-Barre. At that time anthracite was called stone coal because of the difficulty of igniting it and maintaining a fire. It was not generally considered of much value.

Judge Jesse Fell, of Wilkes-Barre, employed stone coal in his nailery as long ago as 1788. But it was 150 years ago today, on February 11, 1808, that Judge Fell demonstrated that anthracite could be burned in an open grate without the aid of a forced draft. He carried on his experiment during the dead of night to avoid ridicule of his less enterprising neighbors who had laughed at his persistent efforts on behalf of stone coal. Judge Fell jotted down the following memorandum:

Made an experiment of burning the common stone coal of the valley in a common fireplace in my house, and find it will answer

the purpose of fuel, making a clearer and better fire at less expense than burning wood in the common way.

And that fire kindled the glow of anthracite throughout the world.

Just 2 years before Judge Fell's demonstration with stone coal, two pioneering brothers, Abijah and John Smith left their home in Connecticut and purchased land with coal beds below Wilkes-Barre. They staked their fortune on a dream. But anthracite was finding use in blacksmiths' forges and as a domestic fuel. Their dream was coming true. Following Judge Fell's success with stone coal, the Smith brothers sent several loads of anthracite down the Susquehanna to Columbia. This coal was shipped in arks—strange looking barges with diamond-shaped bow and stern. By 1812, the Smith brothers found a market for stone coal as far away as New York City.

Anthracite was becoming more widely known and accepted and shortly its use in the industrial sphere was broadened beyond the blacksmith's shop. For in 1812, anthracite was used as fuel in the iron wire works of White and Hazard at the Falls of Schuylkill and about the same time in the rolling mill of Mellon and Bishop.

It was in the smelting of iron ore, that anthracite developed into an indispensable factor in the industrialization of America. Can you imagine American civilization without iron? Iron for engines, stoves, and rails for the miles and miles of railways. But most important of all, in the making of steel for machinery and equipment, girders in buildings, ships, bridges, tools, instruments.

Let us go back to the year 1833, when a Mr. F. W. Geisenheimer took out a patent for smelting iron ore with anthracite. He experimented with anthracite at the Valley Furnace near Pottsville in Schuylkill County—not too successfully. However, in the following year, the hot-air blast was adopted in this country and it became possible to use anthracite in blast furnaces. Two years later, the first really successful smelting of iron ore with anthracite in the United States was achieved by Baughman, Guiteau & Co. near Mauch Chunk in 1838, 120 years ago.

The iron industry was revolutionized by the substitution of anthracite for charcoal. As long as charcoal was used, iron furnaces were limited in size, producing 2 to 4 tons a day. By utilizing anthracite, large and larger furnaces were possible. By 1860, a run of more than 50 tons of pig iron a day was recorded. In 1880, more than a million tons of pig iron were made entirely with anthracite coal as fuel. The center of the iron industry was eastern Pennsylvania.

Today, with airplanes, railroads, and busses, we take for granted swift transportation and travel. But 150 years ago, roads were little better than trails, unimproved, rutty, muddy, impassable during the winter and in the thaws of the spring. The horse, oxcart, and stagecoach were the accepted modes of transportation.

Of what value are natural resources unless they can be marketed? In those

days to haul a ton of merchandise from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh via turnpike cost \$125. Again, anthracite coal played a stellar role in the economic development of America. The first attempts at providing a system of inland navigation originated in building canals in this very anthracite region to ship stone-coal to market. These waterways marked the first great revolution in our means of transportation.

The building of the Schuylkill Canal was one of the earliest such projects agitated in this country. Although the canal was not completed until 1825, part of it was in use as early as 1818. The first shipments of coal were made in 1822. In that year, 1,480 tons were poled down the river. There were as yet no towpaths.

By the end of 1824, boats were making the complete trip from Pottsville to Philadelphia, a distance of 108 miles. In 1827, 2 years after the completion of the canal, the tolls from shipments of coal amounted to \$33,317, of a total of \$58,149.

The largest private enterprise undertaken in America up to that time was the Delaware and Hudson Canal. On January 7, 1825, the subscription books for stock of the company were opened and all the stock was taken up on that day. The purpose of this canal was to ship anthracite from the Northern Wyoming field to tidewater at New York. On December 5, 1828, the first boats carrying coal arrived at Rondout from Honesdale. Anthracite from Pennsylvania transported via the Delaware and Hudson Canal to New York and New England was one of the underlying factors in establishing the industrial supremacy those centers enjoyed for many years.

Many canals were built in the 1820's and 1830's. The North Branch Canal connected Wilkes-Barre with other towns along the Pennsylvania system of canals. The first boat to be used on the canal was built in 1831 and hauled anthracite. The second one, the Luzerne, named after the Luzerne coal region, was launched in 1834 and made a complete trip from Wilkes-Barre to Philadelphia and back again. Anthracite coal canals soon gave way to the "iron monsters" of the new machine age. In actual fact, locomotive engines were the result and anthracite coal the cause; locomotives were first used to move coal.

Our story now takes us to England. It was there in 1825 that George Stephenson, an engineer, invented the steam locomotive. The Delaware & Hudson Canal Co. sent one of its engineers, Mr. Horatio Allen, to England to purchase four locomotives for use in moving coal on its extensive mining properties. There he met and was hospitably received by George Stephenson. Allen purchased 1 locomotive from Robert Stephenson & Co., of Newcastle, and 3 from Foster, Rastrick & Co., of Stourbridge. The Stourbridge Lion arrived first in the United States in 1829. It cost the company \$2,914. On August 8, 1829, Mr. Allen, alone, made the trial run from Honesdale to the present site of Seeleyville and back.

Many years later, Mr. Allen said, in speaking of this historical event, "The

impression was very general that the iron monster would break down the road or that it would leave the track at the curve and plunge into the creek. My reply was, that it was too late to consider the probability of such occurrences. As I placed my hand on the throttle-valve handle, I was undecided whether I would move slowly or with a fair degree of speed; but believing the road would prove safe, and preferring that, if we did go down, to go down handsomely—I started with considerably velocity, passed the curve in safety and was soon out of hearing of the cheers of the large assemblage present."

And that was the first operation of any railroad locomotive in the Western Hemisphere. I need not underscore the significance of this feat in the annals of the development of our country. In a few years, the sound of locomotives, "apuffing, asorting, and awhistling," were heard throughout the entire anthracite region, and then way beyond, to form the vast network of railroads which we know today.

Meanwhile, in 1835 anthracite coal began to be used for the generating of steam on ferryboats plying the Hudson River, displacing wood. Also, in the rising railroad industry, anthracite was burned instead of wood in the fireboxes of the huge steam locomotives. By the middle of the 19th century, the United States attained second place among the nations of the world in coal production, with an annual output of 7 million tons, two-thirds of which was anthracite.

The Civil War gave great impetus to coal mining and in 1864, the market for the first time absorbed 10 million tons. Production kept climbing higher and higher, and by 1873 had reached 21 million tons.

The steady westward march of the American economy meant tremendous growth—expansion in railroads, factories, shipbuilding. The increase in the population itself was enormous. Coal, and anthracite in particular, was becoming constantly more important as a source of the Nation's power. It was truly an underlying factor in American industrial achievement. Economic developments plummeted the United States in 1899 into first place as a coal producer, even surpassing Great Britain.

From 1890 to 1917 anthracite coal was in its heyday. These were boom years. During these 27 years 2 billion tons in all were dug out of the mines. True, bituminous coal and coke had already challenge anthracite in the smelting of iron, and as a source of power in industrial plants. But anthracite was unsurpassed as a heating fuel in homes, offices, and factories. Production advanced steadily. In 1890, almost 46½ million tons, valued at more than \$66 million, were mined; in 1913, more than twice that amount, 92 million tons, with a value of \$195 million, were extracted from the mines.

Then came World War I. Anthracite coal miners, working shoulder to shoulder on the home front, joined the ranks of those fighting for democracy. More coal was needed for heating homes and offices, for power, for our allies abroad. The peak output of 100 million tons was

reached in 1917. In that year, 154,000 men were employed in the hard-coal mines.

During those war years, exports to our needy allies abroad mounted. In 1914 more than 4.2 million tons were shipped overseas. The 1917 total—more than 6 million tons—scored a record up to that time.

The patriotic call to duty was no novelty to anthracite. Before talk of the possibilities of successful commercialization of hard coal was hardly more than a whisper, anthracite had played a part in the War for Independence. In 1776 the first shipments of anthracite or stone coal was made from what is now the hard-coal region to the arsenal at Carlisle, Pa. This coal was then used as fuel in the manufacture of arms for the Continental Army and legend tells us that at Valley Forge, famous for the winter of 1776, stone coal or anthracite was burned in the forge.

Following the lush war period, anthracite production fell off during the twenties although in 1923 more than 93 million tons were mined. Value wise, the inflation of the twenties meant good returns. The best year, 1923, saw the value of anthracite soar to an all time high of almost \$507 million. During the thirties anthracite mining really slumped.

Some of the biggest headlines in coal news were made during the 1920's and 1930's by mechanization. Since then use of machinery has gone on at a great pace. In 1890, 1 miner with his own 2 arms turned out 1½ tons of coal a day. Today, with the aid of a third arm, machinery, 1 miner produces 4¼ tons. More and more coal is being recovered from coal seams near the surface. These are called strip mines. Naturally, machinery can be utilized far more easily than in deep mines. In strip mining coal, power shovels or bulldozers are used to remove surface soil. Coal is recovered from the exposed layers by drilling and blasting, and may then be mechanically loaded. The most recent estimates available indicate that almost 36 percent of anthracite was mined in this way from strip pits. In 1925 only 3 percent of production of hard coal came from these surface mines.

The story of mechanical loading of coal is much the same. Almost one-half of all anthracite mined today is mechanically loaded. In 1927, 31 years ago, 3 percent was loaded by machines and all the rest, by arduous hand labor.

High productivity is among several factors which have combined to achieve high wages. Pay of the anthracite coal miners ranks very favorably among American industries.

It would be unrealistic for us not to realize that anthracite mining has become a so-called mature industry. Throughout the century and a half of its existence, the anthracite industry has met with ups and downs. World War II breathed new life into the anthracite industry. The top production year was 1944 when almost 64 million tons were mined. Because of postwar demands, 1947 and 1948 were good years, too. Since then, output has fallen off. Last

year, anthracite production was valued at \$212 millions. But surely such an industry has a future.

Much effort is being directed toward finding new uses for anthracite. One company is producing coke by mixing anthracite with some bituminous. This could mean that anthracite may stage a comeback in blast furnaces and foundries. In the chemical field, anthracite can be used to produce ammonia and certain alcohols. Also, synthetic gasoline from anthracite is another possibility.

But most important of all is the battle for our natural resources. With no thought of posterity, we have exploited our natural wealth, source of power, heat and light, lavishly and wastefully. Prophetic voices of authority now warn us that at the rate at which we are utilizing natural gas, for instance, we have enough to last only 23 years. And the situation regarding oil is even worse. Furthermore, it will be many years before atomic energy can become a source of cheap, plentiful power. It is also expected that our future demands for energy will be many times greater than present-day requirements.

What is the answer? Coal. There are about 6½ billion tons of recoverable reserves of anthracite coal still untapped in the ground—enough to last from 240 to 1,200 years. Thus, it may well be that as we are celebrating the 150th anniversary of the anthracite-mining industry anthracite will be on the road toward assuming a new importance in our economy.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

COMMONSENSE DICTATES USE OF AMERICA'S UNEMPLOYED MANPOWER

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, commonsense dictates use of America's unemployed manpower. In the 1st session of the 85th Congress, I introduced a distressed-areas bill and we who are members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency soon will consider this step to relieve areas of severe economic distress.

As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I propose to do everything possible to overcome the critical results of the tight-money policy and to achieve a more humane economic condition for the great masses of people in the United States. I am considering a number of such measures, among them a bill to reestablish the Reconstruction

Finance Corporation, which will aid our fast-ailing American economy.

Today, I am introducing a bill to check the growth of unemployment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments for the construction of needed public works and public improvements—an act that may be cited as the Public Works Act of 1958. This is companion legislation to that instituted by two of my distinguished Congressional colleagues, Senators GORE and SPARKMAN. Together we recognize the symptoms of our ailing economy—widespread unemployment. Nationwide it is becoming more and more serious, and in my home State it already has exceeded more than 12 percent of the total insured labor force.

Government action is plainly indicated as necessary at this time to deal with the slump, recession, or whatever you want to label this severe economic decline. These warnings of economic danger of the United States are becoming increasingly clear, and we must take action now to curb that fearful giant of depression before his weight bows the shoulders of millions of Americans. Once this spiral of recession or deflation gets rolling in its ponderous fashion, it could take years to halt the mighty trend. It could, indeed, cause our defeat in the cold war. So, immediate action is called for. The Public Works Act of 1958, as I propose in my bill, is the action which will provide the economic medicine to allow the recovery of our ailing employment system.

SALUTE TO HONORABLE EMANUEL CELLER

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the House has long known of the forensic abilities of our distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER. It is with hesitant feelings that I comment upon the enlightening speech that was given by our versatile colleague on the 6th day of February, dealing with his impressions of Italy and its needs; together with a true analysis of Italian characteristics; and its ambitions to establish a strong republic patterned after our constitutional government.

He depicts Italian life and personality with a philosophical thoroughness that astounded his Italo-American friends. I have never heard any person who, in criticism or eulogy of the Italian or Italo-American type of citizen, is so understanding of their attitudes and emotional character. In a measure, to praise one's own panegyrist is to reflect upon one's ego a feeling of superiority and acceptance of the eulogies heaped upon him. But it would be ungracious not to comment upon his fine efforts to bring about, through his words of praise, the solidarity of all extractions comprising our American peoples. His sincere and

munificent compliments are accepted with the same humility as a student, being instructed by a Master, is stimulated by his words of approbation for the tasks accomplished; thus stimulating greater attainment in the future.

The report of the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, on his travels in Italy this past summer, are informative and factual; and instills in one an acceptance that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] enjoys qualities of sincere understanding. This can only be realized by one who loves people and lives in reality. One is impressed by his complete acceptance of the persons he singles out for approbation as to their works and characters. He is without equal as a man of choice statements and superlative character description. He has a life of experiences that give him great insight in understanding the common man and his problems. He can determine by judging the backgrounds of men, their reactions to unfairness and oppression. He is a deep thinker in solving the problems that confront mankind. He is a man without prejudice and believes that men, as individuals, want to be respected and loved; that men who make mistakes want to be forgiven; that both gentle and rough men want to believe in God. He is a man who respects the pioneer who built the solid social foundation for the development of a free land. Mr. CELLER understands the term freedom, and knows that it cannot be bought; that it is earned by people in living with and respecting the rights of others.

Sometimes greatness glitters through the words of men—his report was written in plain and understandable language, grammatically faultless, almost the work of a literary genius. And it did carry a needed message to all Americans for his stand on the right to admire and give a "pat on the back" to those who seldom feel the sensation of gratitude or plaudits from their fellow men, in recognition of their humble accomplishments.

Congressman CELLER has put us all in his debt, for it was a fine message to all Americans, touching upon the critical problems of a sister republic that believes in our way of life. His histrionic presentation of what Italy has contributed to the world, as in its development of the arts through the ages, is called by those who are cultured the true cradle of civilization.

I am certain that the fine effect his report will have upon all our citizens, and especially upon the Italo-Americans, will reward him for the many laborious hours and extensive research that he spent in preparing the data for the purposes intended.

In conclusion, it could be said that a fertile brain never conceived a barren idea or thought. Congressman CELLER, we, your colleagues, salute you, for what more can a man ask of life after he has met a true and understanding friend. God bless you.

FISCAL PROBLEMS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, all things being equal, which should have priority on the public purse, development of our own water resources and other civilian programs or development of similar programs in foreign countries under the guise of foreign aid? In the light of increasing population and rising unemployment, should we postpone or curtail these domestic projects when there is clear evidence that the Russians are developing theirs at an accelerated pace?

And after Congress takes the initiative and appropriates money for civilian programs, military construction and national defense, does the Bureau of the Budget have the power to freeze the funds and prohibit the agencies from spending them?

The answers to these questions appear to be self-evident on the surface but they go far beyond first impressions. For example, I am satisfied that the average American citizen expects us to provide for a strong national defense. But what most of them do not know is that more and more pressure is being exerted to have purely civilian programs abroad considered as an essential part of our own national defense, and this at the expense of needed similar domestic projects. And carrying out this theory one step further, very few people realize that the Bureau of the Budget in placing a ceiling on the expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress is exercising a function which is fundamentally a Congressional prerogative.

At the beginning of his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower said that we must not become so preoccupied with our desire for military strength that we neglect areas of economic development and other related improvements upon which the foundations of real peace must be laid. Later on, however, he placed unusual emphasis on the foreign-aid program, and concluded by saying that if all the desirable goals he discussed could not be achieved within a balanced budget, then civilian programs must be postponed, transferred in part to the States, or curtailed or eliminated. Now if the latter comes to pass we can anticipate what programs will probably be the first to suffer. I refer to our water resources development programs which all must admit have contributed greatly to our strength through freedom from floods and the provision of industrial increases along our watercourses. This migration to our watercourses by industry contemplated an even greater impetus to our construction effort for resource development—not a decrease ultimately resulting in a reduction of our industrial potential wherein lies a preponderance of our strength.

In any event, a special plea is being made this year for a stronger foreign-aid program. Mr. Eric Johnston, the former head of the United States Chamber of Commerce and more recently connected with the motion-picture industry,

has been appointed to spearhead the movement. It was recently announced that representatives of some 300 organizations are coming to Washington the latter part of this month to advocate and dramatize foreign aid. And the President's state of the Union speech is apparently being construed to mean that larger sums must be provided by American taxpayers to build such things as hydroelectric dams and to develop the inland waterway systems in foreign countries and that if we cannot do all of these things within a balanced budget, then we will have to do without similar and badly needed local projects.

Whatever may be the advantages or disadvantages of a foreign-aid program, I personally think that this sort of philosophy puts the cart before the horse. I think the shoe should be on the other foot and I think that the vast majority of the people in this country feel that we should have a reasonable program of development of our own water resources and that only what is left within a balanced budget should be utilized for similar purposes abroad.

I am sure some of my colleagues little realize how much has been, is being, and can be accomplished in our national resource development at small cost compared to the human and economic security that comes as a byproduct. With reference to the civil functions of the Army engineers I note that the President's budget for fiscal year 1959 carries the amount of approximately \$628 million for all features of their program for construction, maintenance, and all of their other work on rivers and harbors and flood control. This amount of money represents less than 1 percent of the overall budget and is proposed for improvements in our own country which will benefit our people directly on a non-partisan and nonsectional basis and in addition continue to contribute to our economic strength which is so necessary in the attainment of peace. I ask you: Are our military needs so far behind that we must curtail or eliminate some of these works which are also vital to our status in the world? I say that both our military needs and water resource needs properly should proceed together. Russia is doing just this and is making great strides in both.

I am apprehensive that unless these water resource programs proceed at other than a curtailed rate we stand an excellent chance of being eclipsed by Russia, and some of her satellites, in the water resource field as we have been temporarily eclipsed in the race in space. Last December it was my privilege to hear General Itschner, Chief of Army Engineers, imply the possibility of eclipse in his New Orleans speech before the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association—of which I am president. It was alarming to me, and many in his audience, to hear that Russia could progress so rapidly in water resource development while at the same time progress in the missile field to the extent that they could launch an earth satellite.

Since the general made his speech there has been published a memorandum by the chairman, Committee on Interior

and Insular Affairs of the other body which sets forth in detail the strides being made by the Soviets and Red China in river and related water resources development. The ambitious program of work already in being and planned for accomplishment a few years hence is immense and undoubtedly will continue to go forward along with other ambitious programs not aimed entirely at peaceful pursuits.

I would like to quote statements from that memorandum credited to the chief of the Communist Party, Mr. Khrushchev:

The Soviet Union can in the next 15 years not only catch up with the United States in the production of basic items but also outstrip it.

In connection with this statement the memorandum points out that this prophecy relative to power, irrigation, water transportation, and flood control presupposes firsthand knowledge of not only what the Soviets will do in the next 15 years, but also what this Congress is going to do—or is not going to do—for the development of America in the same period of time.

Mr. Khrushchev also says:

We declare war on the United States in peaceful production—we declare that war. We will win over the United States. The threat to the United States is not the intercontinental missile. We are relentless.

I want to emphasize that those words come from a man who sounds determined. They are strong words and the memorandum gives detailed information on progress in water resource development which indicates that the threat is not an idle one.

I do not find in the memorandum a comparison of the Soviet budget for resource development with their overall budget. It may well be that the data assembled for preparation of the memorandum contains that information. It would be interesting to know how they compare and I feel that the progress to date and works planned must certainly require a larger proportion than do those of our country.

I am particularly disturbed about the item in the annual civil functions appropriation bill known as the Mississippi River and tributaries. The Engineers submit to the Bureau of the Budget each year an estimate of their money requirements for this item. The Bureau of the Budget invariably uses the blue pencil and reduces the figure; and the President's budget submitted to Congress each year usually adopts the lower amount. In the last few years the Bureau of the Budget figures have been so far out of line that Congress has been forced to provide funds over and above the budget recommendations. But then what happens? The Bureau of the Budget turns right around and imposes a ceiling on the expenditure of such funds. They simply tell the engineers, "Never mind what the legislative branch did; we order you not to spend more than so much of the funds appropriated by Congress."

But this practice, which has been developed over the years, is not limited by any means to civil functions or civilian

programs. It is applied across the board—and especially in connection with military construction and expenditure of funds for national defense.

Application of these expenditure ceilings has resulted in an economic loss difficult to calculate; work stoppages, delays and the uncertainties which result are costly beyond measure. In some instances where local matching funds have been involved, bond issues have been clouded and a shadow cast on Federal-level relationships which seriously threatens the future success of the partnership arrangement which the President has so vigorously advocated. Contractors are learning that their Federal contracts no longer mean exactly what they say—rather than having funds available to pay him for his work, the Federal agency must say, "Work for nothing until the Bureau of the Budget releases the funds, or stop altogether."

It seems to me that in arrogating unto itself the power to place a limit on expenditure of funds, the executive branch is treading on extremely thin constitutional grounds. The Constitution says that Congress and Congress alone can appropriate money. In view of this constitutional provision, the President admittedly cannot veto a single item in an appropriation bill; he must either approve or disapprove the bill as a whole. And, admittedly, the President cannot any more reduce than he can strike out a total single item. How then can the executive department accomplish the same thing indirectly by simply forbidding the expenditure of a portion of the money appropriated for a particular item?

Bills have been introduced from time to time proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills. Just last year a subcommittee, of which I am chairman, conducted hearings on this very question.

The strange thing is that the present Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Percival F. Brundage, asked for specific language which would authorize the President not only to veto but to reduce an item of appropriation and thereby apparently admits that the practice which he and his predecessors have followed in prohibiting expenditure of a portion of funds appropriated by Congress violates the spirit if not the letter of the Constitution. In a carefully prepared statement presented to the subcommittee on May 27, 1957, in support of House Joint Resolution 47 and other bills, whose purpose is to amend the Constitution to authorize the President to veto individual items in appropriation bills, Mr. Brundage said:

I think it ought to be made clear in whatever bill is reported that authority would be granted to veto legislative provisions as well as appropriation items, and that the authority to veto an appropriation item would include authority to reduce an appropriation—but only to the extent necessary to permit the disapproval of amounts added by the Congress for unbudgeted programs or projects, or of increases by Congress of amounts included in the budget.

Why should the Director of the Bureau of the Budget appear before a committee of Congress to plead for constitutional authority to reduce an appropriation to the extent of increases by Congress of amounts included in the budget, if he already has that authority?

The principle involved in these ceilings is extremely serious and one I believe should be thoroughly explored by the Committee on Appropriations. If carried to the extreme, such an impoundment of funds by the Executive could be used to make the Congress impotent and to defeat the purposes of our democratic form of government.

Is it not possible, for instance, to virtually abolish any function of our Federal system, no matter the wishes of the people as expressed by Congress, simply by refusing to spend the moneys provided? The power of the purse is compelling and should be treated with extreme caution in a government such as ours if we are to maintain its cardinal purposes.

SOIL-BANK PROGRAM

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the cotton farmers in the District it is my honor to represent, and farmers throughout the entire southeast, are hoping that the Department of Agriculture will recommend sufficient appropriations to take care of all applicants for the soil-bank program. We hope the Department of Agriculture will do this immediately after the closing date of February 21. We realize that some States will not use all of their allotted funds and the Department can allot these funds to South Carolina and the other Southeastern States.

Our farmers realize that even after this transfer there will be insufficient funds and that additional appropriations will be necessary. We also realize that unless the Department of Agriculture recommends this appropriation, the President would be forced to veto any appropriation initiated by the Congress alone. I believe this House will overwhelmingly pass an appropriation if recommended by the Agriculture Department. It is the only fair thing to do and I, for one, will most certainly vote and work for an appropriation to take care of all cotton farmers desiring to participate.

Mr. Speaker, the first come, first served method of signing up is unworkable and is not fair. If the Department is not going to recommend sufficient funds for the soil-bank program, it is hoped that they will strongly recommend a pro rata apportionment of the money so that all farmers wishing to participate can do so. Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out on the floor of this House before, it is unhumane and unthinkable that elderly people and those afflicted with physical infirmities are required to

stand in line all night in the cold and rail to have their applications considered. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, these applications are scheduled in the dead of winter. In many cases the people needing soil bank payments the most are eliminated from receiving soil bank benefits because of this practice of first come first served. There is much confusion in this program that can only be eliminated by a forthright policy on the part of the Department of Agriculture.

DAVID AARON MILLER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, Panther Valley, Lehigh County, my Congressional District and, indeed, the State of Pennsylvania, have sustained an irreparable loss in the demise of David A. Miller, founder of the Morning Call of Allentown, Pa., and the president of the Call-Chronicle newspapers.

Mr. Miller, who would have observed his 89th birthday anniversary next April 7, was an alumnus of the famous Muhlenberg College named after General Muhlenberg, first Speaker of the House of Representatives. He took up newspaperwork immediately upon his graduation, in 1894, and a few months later became the cofounder of the Allentown Morning Call. While building up this great newspaper, which serves my constituents so well, Mr. Miller assumed and consistently, until his death, maintained leadership in community life, devoting his time unsparingly to church work, enlightened community projects and spent his time and efforts most generously in the field of education of our youth.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include two editorials eulogizing Mr. Miller:

[From the Allentown (Pa.) Morning Call of January 23, 1958]

DAVID A. MILLER

(By Percy B. Ruhe)

"Lord now lettest thou Thy servant depart in peace, according to Thy word."

From the Book of Books come the aptest words to sum up the emotions of this community as it learns today, in deep sorrow, of the passing of David A. Miller to eternal rest.

It is fitting that this, his requiem, should be taken from the Book of which Mr. Miller, with the Psalmist of old, could say: "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path."

It was by the light of that word that both his private and his public life was lived during years, all too short in number for all the service that he strove to give to his God and to his fellowman.

This community will mourn the passing of David A. Miller as it has mourned very few others. And it will mourn the more as today it reviews the life of this good and just man, a very paragon of excellence in human virtues.

Shakespeare has such a manner of man in mind when he makes Hamlet say: "What a piece of work is a man. How noble in rea-

son. How infinite in faculty; in form and moving how express and admirable; in action how like an angel; in apprehension how like a god."

Here was a man whom it could be said that, during 63 years of active life here in this community, he never willfully harmed anyone but had aided and encouraged everyone with whom he had come in contact during those years. And like the beloved Will Rogers he could have said, and in effect was saying: "I never met a man I didn't like."

It can be said without fear of contradiction that he devoted his life to this community and used all the forces he could muster to the advantage of our people and our institutions. It will require columns elsewhere in our papers to specify those institutions and how his voice, time, and purse until his very last days were at their disposal. And it is to be noted that his was not lipservice to the many institutions whose cause he espoused. To them he gave active aid and wise counsel.

There were some strange contradictions in his life. Some had important part in the development of this man who, despite intimate acquaintanceship with and deep faith in a religion of ancient foundations, had an entirely modern outlook upon the people of our times and the development of our western civilization.

Throughout all his life he was a person of frail physique. Illness was well known to him. Often his family and friends despaired of his life. Yet he came within a few months of attaining his 89th birthday and it was not until recent weeks that anything like serious illness had afflicted him. This physical frailty as well as the economic struggle in which he engaged during his teenage years militated against participation in and enjoyment of sports. Yet those masculine qualities which make a man's man were his in abundance.

Then too he was a man soft of speech and slow to anger. Profanity was unthinkable for his lips. Violent speech always was eschewed. Yet he had a will as strong as iron and he held inflexibly to deep purpose and firm convictions.

He was, as one can know from these qualities, the humblest of men although his achievements, his prestige and power were such as could have made a vain man, an abomination to his fellows.

Although he was naturally humble and self-effacing, it could have been said of him as was said by a wise man of old: "Seest thou a man diligent in his business? He shall stand before kings." In fact, as destiny shaped his ends, he did stand in all human dignity before kings, political, intellectual and spiritual.

Here was a man endowed with the soundest albeit not the showiest virtues. He was a quiet man, yet his was the quality of fearlessness in the performance of what he regarded as his duty to God and man. Although he himself at times despaired of his own health and sought to live a life of retirement and escape from the rigors of business, destiny, it now can be seen, directed his steps to return to the nurture of his brain child—The Morning Call—and to enhance his helpfulness to his people by direction of the paper along the way that he always believed it should go.

If there was one regret in Mr. Miller's life, as his newspaper enterprise waxed and grew mightily, it was that the intimate relationships and understanding that existed between employer and employee in his early days of newspaper publication could not be developed as rapidly as the staff during its growth to nearly half a thousand full-time employees and many times that number of part-time employees.

Despite this, and to the marvel of our people, it was amazing how he got around to sickbeds and how he turned up, instinctively

as it were, when someone needed his help and consolation.

Calmly, with firm and determined strides, he walked through a long life and with sure-footed judgment avoided most of the pitfalls that beset man on all sides.

With mighty willpower he fanned the often faint spark of life into flame and extended his years far beyond the traditional threescore and ten.

With strength of character that was in sharp contrast with physical frailty he gave everything that he had to the performance of his duties as he saw them, even to the sacrifice of his own comfort and the sapping of his strength.

Weak himself, he relied upon a higher power, upon the highest power. He long since had followed the injunction of the Apostle: "Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth."

Those who in even small part share his deep religious faith believe that the souls of the righteous are in the hands of the Lord.

At best we of the Fourth Estate can but feebly engrave our tribute to a godly man with whom it was permitted us to walk through many years. His life and work constitute an imperishable page in our history.

With all who knew and loved him as husband, father, friend, we can say:

His life was gentle, and the elements so mixed in him that Nature might stand up and say to all the world, "This was a man."

[From the Allentown (Pa.) Evening Chronicle of January 25, 1958]

THIS WEEK: NOTES AND COMMENTS

(By W. D. Reimert)

To those of us who knew David Miller over the years through the intimacy of the Call-Chronicle newspaper organization, the things which set him apart from other men were these:

His utter simplicity.

His uncanny ability to lead an uncluttered life by refusing to permit the extraneous, the tawdry, the wasteful to consume his time and means and strength.

One did not normally consider David A. Miller efficiently energetic as measured by today's standards. Yet there was about him a magnificent orderliness and capacity to get things done, both of which were belied by the appalling disorder of his desk, his slow, swinging gait, the softness of his speech, his refusal to become visibly excited or angry or hurried. He always seemed to have time for everything because he had an infallible sense of the importance of things.

He had no consciousness of things insofar as they would add to his own convenience or gratification. He had no patience with frivolous activities which dissipate men's days and energy because it was his nature to put first things first, and in many cases the things he put first were the simplest—such as friendship and loyalty, religion and the obligations of publishing a newspaper with interests other than making money.

Because of the simplicity of his nature, David A. Miller's approach was invariably the direct one. In him there was no deviousness.

If he got a letter, he answered it immediately, usually on a penny post card or with the shortest of handwritten notes. Only in later years, when failing eyesight made it necessary, did he employ a secretary. If he got a story, he wrote it forthwith and gave it to the city desk. The result was he was habitually caught up with his correspondence and his work. While the rest of us were putting things off, and chafing over the fleetness of the hours he always seemed to have hours to spare.

If he heard someone was angry because of something that had been published in his newspapers or for any other reason involving

him personally, he paid the offended individual a visit. "Never telephone an angry man," he used to say, "go and see him."

That is why David A. Miller had no enemies. He could ask as did the Roman Emperor Sigismund, "Do I not destroy my enemies by making them my friends?"

Toward friendship his approach was also simple and direct. If someone he knew was sick, he didn't send a card; he went to the hospital. If a friend died, he didn't send flowers; he attended the funeral. If someone was in trouble, he didn't stand by for a call; he offered help. If someone needed money, he did not wait to be solicited; he sent a check.

So it was with religion. It was David Miller's nature to be religious. He believed religion an intensely personal thing and he dealt directly with his God without show or affectation. He did not think a Christian's duty fulfilled with the writing of a check, large as it might be. No meal was served in his home without prayer; no day passed without a careful reading of the Scripture. Few men knew the Bible more intimately than he, yet even in his later years he was constantly finding in it something new and exciting. He attended church as naturally as most men sit down to breakfast. It never occurred to him to be intolerant of another's beliefs.

David A. Miller knew in his unerring way that change and progress are inevitable, and unlike so many of his generation he did not bemoan the passing of the good old days or yearn for their return. On the contrary, his interest in and his curiosity about the new were insatiable. He flew in airplanes with delight and enthusiasm well into his eighties. If the latest model printing machine was brought into the plant, he did not refer to it as one of those newfangled things he used to get along without; he wanted to know how it worked, and in short order he did.

He did not dwell in the past, but out of the yesterdays he had retained a simple distillation of that which brought him deep pleasure. Part of this distillation was a love of the good earth and a profound respect for the men who bring forth its fruits. He never ceased to thrill over the miracle of growing things. Even in his late seventies he tilled the soil of his home garden with his own hands and planted trees on his Lowhill Township farm. To David A. Miller a bowl of June berries, a platter of July corn on the cob or a dish of red October apples were not just something good to eat; they were an exciting manifestation of Nature's mysterious and ceaseless cycles. He accorded them fitting respect, and so he derived from them exceptional satisfaction. He found a mystic poetry in a field of ripening grain and the ultimate in fragrance in a meadow's new-mown hay. Some of his happiest hours were spent on the porch of a summer home in his boyhood town of Saegersville where the song of the cicada made the music he loved the most.

As a newspaperman, David A. Miller had to be interested in the world and what went on from day to day in its farflung corners. But the most important place was always the little section of the world encompassed by the Lehigh Valley. To its growth and development, its institutions and its people he gave of himself and his funds and his understanding and his boundless love, unstintingly and without thought of reward because it was his nature so to do.

One looks around, now that he is gone, and finds on every hand monuments to this man who lived his uncluttered life in a forceful but uniquely simple way. Monuments of brick and stone in school buildings and churches, in hospitals and old-folks homes, in charitable institutions, and business establishments, and newspapers dedi-

cated to public service because they were molded to his own special pattern. And other less tangible memorials, too, in the lives he touched and the characters he helped form and the great surge of affection and grief in the wake of his passing.

On the occasion of Mr. Miller's 80th birthday on April 7, 1949, we wrote in these columns:

"Unlike so many men his age, David Miller does not live in the yesterday of his life. Having done his best in the past, he puts it aside and looks with the vision and energy of a young man toward the bright tomorrow. For 80 years this tomorrow has been unfolding itself to him in an endless succession of wonders, encompassing every phase of man's existence. Unafraid of change, he looks forward, as his ninth decade of life begins, to new landmarks of progress in the march of civilization and his beloved Lehigh Valley with the calm philosophy of one who, having served his fellow men well, is at peace with himself and his God, treasuring in his heart that most precious of all possessions—the respect and abiding love of all who know him."

These lines could also be his epitaph.

USE OF UNITED STATES PLANES IN BOMBING TUNISIA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the American people and the Members of Congress are entitled to know by what authority French military forces used United States warplanes to bomb and strafe a Tunisian village causing some 200 casualties, including women and children.

Were these warplanes made available to the French for the common defense of Western Europe or for the purpose for which they were used? Did the French pay for them or were these planes in the nature of gifts under the so-called mutual security program?

The American people are entitled to an immediate and crystal clear statement from Secretary of State Dulles as to how these United States warplanes were obtained by the French and what restrictions, if any, were placed upon their use.

If Secretary of State Dulles does not provide a full and clear statement, I insist, Mr. Speaker, that Congress proceed immediately to summon the Secretary to explain in a public hearing his dereliction to the people by whom he is employed and to whom he is responsible.

It is not sufficient for this administration to be merely disturbed by this deliberate use of United States planes for the killing of virtually defenseless people.

THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include related matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, some men drift with the times. Others inscribe their names in the pages of history as martyrs to a cause, a cause unpopular at the time but destined in future times to become a rallying cry for men in all walks of life around the world. Knowing the futility of their efforts, they choose not to turn and drift, but to be found by the wall when the victors storm the gates.

It is men such as these that epitomize progress. It is men such as these that shape the history of the human race. Such a man was Thaddeus Kosciusko. Born in tyranny, this man had within him the spark of greatness so many possess but so often is left to die in frustration and disappointment. This man fanned that spark and while not successful in his own native land of Poland, he helped give another land, another people, the freedom he could not give his own.

Thaddeus Kosciusko's name is not a familiar one in our classrooms today. Yet the contribution he made to this Nation's independence was no small one. He borrowed money to come to our shores; he gave of his genius to drive the British troops from our soil; and then, the battle won, he returned to Poland to lead the struggle against despotism there.

For most, it would have been more than enough to have helped one people to freedom. It would have been easy to rest on the laurels so well earned, to enjoy the plaudits of a grateful people. But the driving spirit of Thaddeus Kosciusko could brook no pause. While tyranny existed, he had to fight it. Where he lived, there he had to go.

In 1784 he left this country to return to his native Poland, there to wage an unceasing, but unfortunately, unrewarded, crusade for freedom. He left behind him the memory of a man—a foreigner some might call him—who built the defenses on the Delaware River, who designed the fortification for the battle at Saratoga, a major turning point in the War of the Revolution. But, more than this, he left behind a heritage that belongs to no one country but to mankind.

Love of freedom, friendship for his fellow man, a willingness to sacrifice—these are the legacies of Thaddeus Kosciusko and others like him. They remind us, as we face the threat of a latter-day despotism, that freedom is not easily held, that the price required is high. It is no easy road they blazed. To travel it takes courage and endurance, and those that do not have them will soon find their road leads to slavery.

Today we honor the 212th anniversary of Thaddeus Kosciusko's birth, not only for the great contributions he made to this Nation, but for the ideals he lived by. Today we face the choice he faced—drift or decision. May history judge us as it has judged him, as men who spurned the easy way, who declined to drift and boldly chose the high road of decision. May we never forget his example as we move forward in the everlasting battle for democracy in which he gave his life.

RECIPROCAL TRADE

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah? There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, predictions have been made freely during recent weeks that the Trade Agreements Act is in mortal danger at this session of Congress. The reason for the growing unpopularity of this legislation is self-evident: too many sections of our country and too many segments of our economy have been hit too hard by foreign competitors wielding an unfair trade advantage.

I speak as one who has voted for each extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act during my tenure in Congress, but I also speak as one who has cast his vote more reluctantly each time as the defects of the legislation became more and more evident.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which I believe will dissolve much of the opposition to the Trade Agreements Act while retaining provisions of the administration's proposal for a 5-year extension. It will permit sound and vigorous development of world trade but with more adequate assurance that our own economy received fair and equal consideration.

This would be accomplished by strengthening the hand of Congress in those instances where a domestic industry has proved to the Tariff Commission's satisfaction that it is being injured seriously by trade concessions.

Briefly, my bill provides that the Tariff Commission recommendations in escape-clause proceedings shall go to Congress instead of to the President as is now the case. Either House of Congress could overrule the Commission, but in the absence of a majority vote against these recommendations by either House, the recommendations would become effective in 60 days.

As we all know, the escape-clause provision came into the Trade Agreements Act in 1951 as a recognition by Congress that in the balance between foreign relations and domestic well-being, the scales were being tipped too consistently by the heavy hand of diplomacy.

But under the present mechanics of the escape-clause procedure, we still hear the frequent charge that Congress has delegated its tariff-making powers to the State Department.

Since June 1951, the Tariff Commission has completed 71 escape-clause investigations. In 23 of those cases, the Commission found the domestic industry undergoing sufficient injury to recommend escape-clause action; in 5 others, the Commission was evenly divided. But of those 28 cases, the President has invoked the escape clause in only 9. Two are still pending.

I do not suggest that all, or any set ratio, of Tariff Commission recommendations should be adopted. But this low proportion of escape-clause actions certainly suggests that we are still leaning over backwards in our concessions to foreign competitors.

As an example, I shall cite the domestic lead and zinc industry, because that is the proceeding with which I am most familiar.

In 1953, the lead and zinc industry went before the Tariff Commission to complain that it was being seriously crippled by the existing trade agreement on its products. Volumes of expert testimony, pro and con, were submitted and from the record the Commission, with the services of an expert staff, reported unanimously to the President that the domestic lead and zinc industry was being seriously injured by foreign imports.

However, the State Department's opposing viewpoint—to the effect, it seems, that the industry's troubles were only temporary—prevailed. An alternative stockpiling program offered only slight relief, and last year foreign imports again swamped the market.

Today, our lead and zinc mines are in sorrier shape than ever. Deep mine shafts have been abandoned and flooded; thousands of miners are out of work. The industry has been forced to come again before the Tariff Commission, where the case is still under investigation.

But even if help is now forthcoming, our domestic lead and zinc industry—important to our economy and essential to our defense—will never be the same as it was before. It has become only too clear how right the Tariff Commission was in the first place.

My bill does not take away from the President the power to negotiate new trade agreements and to reduce tariffs. But it does give American industries and American workers the opportunity—when they can show the Tariff Commission that they are being injured by an existing trade agreement—to have their case finally determined by someone other than the person who drew up that agreement.

What other body of Government is more qualified to make this final determination than the Congress, in which rests the constitutional power to set tariffs?

WHAT THE NEW BILL DOES

The bill which I have introduced gives the President everything he requested in his trade message. It incorporates all of H. R. 10368, the legislation embodying the President's trade recommendations.

However, my bill makes substantial changes in the theory and procedures under the peril-point and escape-clause provisions. These changes are made by the addition of four new sections to H. R. 10368.

Section 5 of the bill modifies peril-point and escape-clause investigations and procedures.

Section 6 increases the membership of the Tariff Commission from 6 to 7 and the length of their terms from 6 years to 7 years.

Section 7 sets up the machinery whereby the Tariff Commission reports its findings on peril-point and escape-clause hearings and specifies how these reports are handled after being transmitted to Congress.

Section 8 provides how pending cases now awaiting action by the President shall be handled.

Following is a section-by-section analysis in more detail of the material which, in addition to the provisions of H. R. 10368, this legislation would incorporate into the Reciprocal Trade Act.

SECTION 5

The explanation of section 5 is divided into two parts, dealing separately with its effect upon peril-point and escape-clause procedures.

PERIL POINT—PRESENT LAW

Under the present law, the President is required to furnish the Tariff Commission with a list of all articles upon which the duties would be changed by a proposed trade agreement. This list must be presented to the Commission before negotiations begin. The Commission is then required to hold public hearings and report back to the President within 120 days on the extent to which the duties can be changed without causing serious injury to domestic industry. The President cannot act until after this 120-day period.

PROPOSED CHANGES

All of the above provisions of the present peril-point law are retained. The Tariff Commission, in addition, is required to send a copy of its recommendations to both Houses of Congress. This report is for information purposes only.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this amendment is to keep Congress informed as to the effect of proposed reciprocal trade agreements before they are entered into by the President. This is only consistent with the delegation to Congress by the Constitution of the power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises." The present law only requires notification to Congress after an agreement has been entered into.

ESCAPE CLAUSE—PRESENT LAW

The President, either House of Congress, the Senate Finance Committee, or the House Ways and Means Committee, or an "injured party" can require the Tariff Commission to make an investigation to determine whether domestic industry is being threatened by trade concessions. This investigation must be made within 9 months; then the Commission's findings are reported to the President in the form of a recommendation and, within 60 days or sooner if the President takes action on the recommendation, an identical report is sent to the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee. If the President declines to follow the recommendation, he must report his reasons to the Senate and House Committees within 60 days after receiving the Commission report.

PROPOSED CHANGES

The major change is to require the Tariff Commission to make a definite recommendation to Congress rather than to the President. This recommendation must be delivered to both Houses of Congress on the same day, and must be delivered while Congress is in session.

The findings must be specific and may include any of the following or a combination of them:

First. Permanent withdrawal of the trade concession.

Second. Modification of the trade concession.

Third. Suspension of the concession in whole or in part.

Fourth. Limitation of the quantity of the product which may be entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption.

In the event the Tariff Commission finds that any or all of the above actions are necessary to protect a domestic industry, this finding goes into effect—unless vetoed by a majority of the Members of either House—after the first period of 60 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following receipt of the finding. "Continuous session" is defined as one unbroken by an adjournment sine die. Excluded from the 60-day period are any days in which there has been an adjournment of either House for more than 3 days.

PURPOSE

This section gives to Congress the power to decide what action, if any, should be taken after the Tariff Commission by a majority vote finds that a trade agreement is injuring domestic industry. Either House, by a majority vote of its membership, has the power to overrule the Tariff Commission.

One of the major difficulties we now face is that Congress has delegated to the President the power to set tariffs and quotas. This measure does not take away that power, but it does take away the power of deciding what action, if any, should be taken after the Tariff Commission finds that a domestic industry is being injured by a trade agreement set by the President. In effect, Congress would become the final judge of whether a trade agreement is a mistake, ending the situation whereby the President, by inaction, nullifies a finding of the Tariff Commission.

SECTION 6—PRESENT LAW

The Tariff Commission now has 6 members appointed for 6-year terms by the President with the consent of the Senate.

PROPOSED CHANGE

The membership would be increased to 7 and the terms lengthened to 7 years. The bill provides for a smooth transfer from the 6-year to the 7-year tenure.

PURPOSE

If Congress is to have the final decision on escape-clause recommendations, these recommendations must be definite and have the backing of a majority of the Tariff Commission. It would be impossible for either House to act if the Commission divided 3-3 as it has done in 5 cases in the past. The law still reserves to the President the power of appointment—with consent of the Senate.

SECTION 7—NEW LEGISLATION

This section sets up the procedure by which the Tariff Commission's recommendations are handled in Congress. It provides that the Commission findings shall be referred to the Finance Commit-

tee in the Senate and to the Ways and Means Committee in the House. Provision is made to discharge the recommendation from committee if the committee has not reported the resolution within 10 days after receipt. Priorities of motion are defined and debate limits set in this section.

PURPOSE

Special rules must apply for legislation which becomes effective in the absence of action by Congress. The language in this section is necessary for the law to be constitutional. Amendments to the Tariff Commission's specific report are forbidden because the amendment would require signature of the President and thus the plan would be defeated. The automatic discharge is to insure Members of a chance to reject the Commission recommendation.

SECTION 8—NEW LEGISLATION

Provides that the new procedure of transferring decision on "escape clause" from President to Congress shall become effective simultaneous with approval of the act. All pending cases upon which the President has neither made a decision nor reported to Congress would be submitted to Congress as provided above.

1960 OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill that would permit the Department of Defense to cooperate with the 1960 Olympic Games Committee with respect to the winter games to be held in Squaw Valley, Calif.

Holding of the 1960 winter Olympic games in the United States will mark a new approach in our international relations and center in this country at that time the eyes of the world, just as was the case when these games were held in Germany and Italy.

The VIII Olympic winter games will focus the eyes of the world on us.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader regarding the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday bills on the Consent Calendar will be called and there is one suspension to be considered on H. R. 9700, the Veterans Benefit Act.

On Tuesday bills on the Private Calendar will be called.

The Department of Interior appropriation bill for 1959 will be called up for consideration on Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday; thereafter House Joint Resolution 2, which has to do with the Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, will be considered.

There is the usual reservation that any further program will be announced later; and conference reports, if any, may be brought up at any time.

Mr. KEATING. May I inquire of the majority leader in light of inquiries I have had, it is not the intention to program next week the appropriation bill which we had up for consideration on Monday of this week?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. I consider the action of the Committee of the Whole as an instruction to withhold the matter pending further consideration of the bill by the Subcommittee on Appropriations and, I suppose, the full committee.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, February 20, 1958, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to a special order agreed to today the Chair designates the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the reading of the Journal on February 20, 1958.

THE FLIGHT OF FLUE-CURED TOBACCO FARMERS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, thousands of flue-cured tobacco farmers are being forced off the American farms each year, due to the continued reduction of acreage allotments. In my home district, the Eighth Congressional District of Georgia, as well as in all the other flue-cured tobacco farming areas, the reduction of this acreage combined with the rising costs of living have cre-

ated desperate financial burdens, unable to be sustained, by the small farmer.

What is so often overlooked, except by those in the actual operation, is that the cost of machinery and equipment needed for the growing of tobacco does not decrease with the acreage reductions. A barn to cure the tobacco costs the same whether you grow 1 acre or 5 acres. A truck to haul equipment and carry the tobacco to the warehouse will not be one-half the sale price merely because the allotment has been sliced by that amount. It can readily be seen that, as the amount of tobacco a farmer can grow is cut, his chances for financial survival are dwindled.

One of the greatest harms to these small farmers has been the practice in recent years of our American tobacco companies buying and importing flue-cured tobacco from Canada. This, at first impression, seems to be almost harmless. But when you realize the lack of restrictions on Canadian tobacco growers, it becomes fully evident that there is an almost irreparable injury being done to the American tobacco farmer by this practice.

It is a stab in the back to the small tobacco-growing farmer when American cigarette manufacturers import these tobaccos from abroad. The manufacturers have been made rich and are growing richer because the American farmer has been the chief source of supply. If they continue the practice of imports, they will not only wipe out the American tobacco farmer, but they will put themselves at the mercy of foreign growers, who will be able to charge whatever the traffic will bear, just as Canadian paper manufacturers have had a stranglehold on the newsprint industry of America for many years.

Hundreds of farmers in my own district who no longer have enough acreage to farm their own land have to go to Canada during the tobacco season to process the Canadian crop for weekly wages. These farmers are forced to take these jobs in Canada because they are deprived of the opportunity of using their skill to farm their own farms. Although Canadians have no acreage controls on growing tobacco, they are not yet growing it as extensively as they will, once they have learned the process of growing and curing from the American farmer. The sad plight of the tobacco farmer is further aggravated by the fact that our foreign markets for American tobaccos are being taken away from us by giant farm corporations, who move from the United States to Mexico and to countries in Africa with American machinery and know-how and no acreage controls. They sell in foreign countries just below the price within the United States.

We have tried for years to get relief from this deplorable situation from the State Department, but our State Department is not interested in the plight of suffering humanity in the United States—only in that in other countries—where it uses the program of foreign aid to destroy our own producers.

Buying American tobacco is as much a matter of self-preservation to the American tobacco companies as it is a matter

of preservation to the American tobacco farmer.

I have written letters to all of the American cigarette manufacturers, warning them of the dangerous situation, and urging revision of their buying policy.

PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE BY THE LITHUANIAN PEOPLE

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, today we join with Lithuanians everywhere in commemorating the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Lithuanian people on February 16, 1918.

The history of this brave people is marked by a never-ending struggle for and devotion to liberty. Although Lithuania has enjoyed self-government only at intervals, her people have not ceased to fight against the dominance of the Russian rulers. Yes; those who have known freedom will not quickly let the flame die in their hearts.

Forty years ago, after more than 100 years of keeping their ideal of national independence alive, the Lithuanian people reached their goal and proclaimed their independence. In the following twenty-some years they clearly demonstrated their ability to progress under self-government. Their achievements in the fields of education, culture, economy, and social welfare are well-known and widely recognized. But soon after the outbreak of World War II, Lithuania again felt the crush of the tyrant's heel.

We know that the historical battle for freedom goes on, though the voices of the Lithuanian people are silent. We who are free must speak for them and rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom for all mankind.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago, the people of the little nation of Lithuania proclaimed their independence. Only people of Lithuanian blood who are fortunate enough to live in the Free World can openly commemorate this anniversary because this small country, against the will of its fine people, are victims of Soviet aggression and oppression.

While Lithuania is enslaved by its Communist masters, the sad plight of her people is not forgotten—nor has it ever been condoned—by the people of America. On this occasion the great heart of America is extended in sympathetic understanding to Lithuanians and to all those other peoples who have been imprisoned by the whiplash of Soviet police state methods. These people are kept in subjection at the point of the bayonet

and the gun. Everyone with common-sense knows what would happen if a free election could be held in Lithuania and her sister states. They would throw out their Communist masters within 60 seconds.

I do not believe that a government which is based entirely upon fear and force can endure perpetually. As long as the spark of freedom burns in human souls, as it does with the people of Lithuania, the hope of liberation will live and it must eventually prevail. Freedom is the God-given right of every man and woman. This sacred right must at length succeed.

The Government of the United States has never recognized the Soviet annexation of Lithuania. I cannot conceive of it ever doing so. The people of this little nation should realize, on this anniversary of their lost independence, that the friendship and the moral support of the American people is theirs. Their prayers for freedom will someday be answered.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE LITHU- ANIAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I have the honor and the privilege of bringing to the attention of the Members of the House, the Nation, and the world a commemorative exercise paying tribute to a brave nation and a great people of the Republic of Lithuania. I would have you know that the United States of America has never, does not now, and never shall recognize the annexation by Soviet Russia of the Baltic Provinces of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

We here know full well of the great contribution made down through the years by American citizens in whose veins flows the proud blood of Lithuanian ancestry, and so in this Hall, this precise Hall, where for 100 years Americans, on the spot on which I now stand, have held forth in this greatest tribunal of democracy in the history of the world, it is fitting and proper that we pay this tribute to the Republic of Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, national independence is the most cherished, the most highly prized and sometimes the most difficult of all political goals to be attained by a people. Some people attain it as the result of long and costly struggles. Others, who are more fortunate, are presented with it as a gift from the gods. Still others inherit it from dim and distant past and take it for granted. Those who have struggled and made untold sacrifices for their independence and freedom have the greater satisfaction from the attainment of their national goal.

In contrast to those who have attained independence, there is another group of peoples to whom national freedom and independence have been persistently denied. Because of some historic freak; because of certain turns and twists of

unforeseen and always predictable events, national independence has almost always eluded them even when they had thought it was within their reach. Regardless of the means employed in its attainment, all national groups consider national independence as their ultimate political goal. For that reason they would not hesitate to stake their all, their worldly and spiritual possessions, for its attainment and for its defense. Such has been the course of many national histories, including the history of the Lithuanians.

The birth of modern Lithuanian state goes back to the year 1253. In that year the country was united under the rule of a single monarch. Since that date, for more than 700 years, Lithuania's turbulent and uneven history has had its ups and downs. That history is marked by greatness and glory during the first few centuries, while misery and misfortune claim a large share in the lives of the Lithuanians during the greater part of the last 200 years. During the 14th and 15th centuries Lithuania became one of the most powerful and great states in all eastern and northern Europe. In the 16th century Poland and Lithuania were united under a Lithuanian king. From then on the fate of Lithuania was determined by the fate of Poland. Late in the 18th century, when Poland lost her independence and most of that country was incorporated in czarist Russia, Lithuania shared the same fate.

For almost a century and a half the stalwart and stout-hearted Lithuanians suffered under the harsh and inefficient Russian regime. During that unhappy time, however, the Lithuanians did not lose sight of their national objective, the attainment of their national independence. In 1918, as the result of the Russian Revolution, when the czarist regime crumbled these brave and proud Lithuanians who had weathered many severe storms in their national history, who had quietly maintained their sturdy national characteristics under adversity and had successfully kept alive their love for freedom, proclaimed their national independence on February 16, 40 years ago today.

For the next 22 years, prior to the tragic events of 1940, all friends of freedom followed the steady progress made by the Lithuanians in their newly-created independent country. All Lithuanians were justly proud of the splendid record of performance during those two peaceful decades. Lithuania's political, economic, cultural, and social life had developed along broad and progressive democratic lines. During that relatively short time Lithuania became a model democracy in northeastern Europe.

Early in the last war independent Lithuania became a tragic casualty. First, it was brought by brute force under the heel of the Red army. It was made part of the Soviet Union. Then, when the Nazi and Communist tyrannies began to wage their life-and-death struggle in 1941, Lithuania came under the Nazi yoke. Finally, toward the end of the war, Red forces came in once more as liberators, and they have been there as conquerors ever since. This libera-

tion, Soviet style, has been so complete that since 1945 Lithuania has been hermetically sealed off from the free world. Soviet propaganda and oppressive measures have been at work trying to uproot the spirit of independence and freedom among Lithuanians. These liberty-loving people have either been silenced, incarcerated or carted off in freight cars to distant and desolate parts of the Soviet Union. They have been evicted by tens of thousands from their homes on the Baltic shores and their place is being colonized by Communist Russians from Asiatic Russia. In these tragic circumstances, there can hardly be a celebration of national independence day there.

In this country we join all Americans of Lithuanian descent today, on the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. To these people who did so much in the regeneration and rebuilding of independent Lithuania, who gladly made sacrifices for the well-being and happiness of unfortunate Lithuanians, we join in the commemoration of this historic event, and express the hope that in the not too distant future, Lithuanians will also be celebrating their independence day in their own homeland.

We hope that these words and these ceremonies will be projected by the Voice of America to every place in Lithuania, where the torch of liberty still is held high this day, that this message to the Lithuanian people and the underground "forest men" may be clear: "We here in America have not forgotten you and we never shall. We say to you in that most ancient and beautiful tongue, *Kas bas! Kas bas! reparašus Oh Lietuva, Lietuva!*"

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I trust and hope that the voice of the gentleman will be heard all over the world and particularly in enslaved Lithuania, where Soviet Russia has embarked on a policy of extermination of that brave, small nation. It seems tragic to me that when we are appraising the effects of the efforts of the Russian imperialists toward world domination and colonization of large areas of Europe and Asia, too few people remember the plight of the subjected and brutally exploited peoples of the Baltic, particularly those in Lithuania. I congratulate the gentleman on his timely and splendid reminder.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman and, Mr. Speaker, you know, of course, the gentleman who has just addressed us is the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. We in the House know that he perhaps more than any speaks with knowledge and wisdom of these facts that I recite.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep emotion that I join with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and others of my colleagues in expression of our stout friendship for the brave people of Lithuania on this, the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

There are many fine and outstanding men and women of Lithuanian blood in the district that I have the honor to represent. In the city of Chicago in every activity, in the cultural arts and in the professions, in religion, business, and in the trades, the Lithuanian-Americans have made a rich contribution. My association with many of them in the folds of a warm personal friendship has extended through several decades.

Stanley Kodis, wrested from his home in Lithuania and thrown into the torture camps of Siberia, finally escaping to Chicago to renew the battle for a free Lithuania, was my friend, and with him it was my privilege to plead the cause of Lithuania before many mass meetings in Chicago. This was several decades ago. Stanley Kodis has been gone many years, but the battle of the proud people of Lithuania for freedom and human dignity continues in this day as always it will until Lithuania is a free and sovereign nation with a government chosen by the people and dedicated to the service of the people.

President Harding was a friend of the cause of Lithuania, and when he died a national delegation of Lithuanian-Americans attended his funeral. I was honored by invitation to accompany the delegation and when we passed in the line of mourners we noticed with an appreciating sentiment that the floral offering, expression of the grief of Lithuanian-Americans, had been placed at the head of the casket. Since then we have had the Presidencies of Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower—five Presidents—and the battle of a proud people for freedom and dignity goes on with undiminished spirit. So it will continue until Lithuania again is free with a government chosen by the people and dedicated to the service of the people.

In the dreadful years of the depression, when all but courage and faith had been swept away, it was a young woman, daughter of emigrants from Lithuania, who abandoned a musical career that might have carried her to the heights to render her unselfish service to alleviating the suffering of a generation crushed in the debris of an atomized economy. Hers was the spirit of Lithuania, the spirit of a proud people that no tyrant can crush nor any power of evil long imprison, the spirit of a humane and proud people that will never be quieted until Lithuania again is free with a government chosen by the people and dedicated to the service of the people.

Lithuanians constitute only 1 of some 200 nationalities in the Soviet prison-house. For two decades Lithuania prospered as an independent republic. Con-

stitutional difficulties were well on the way to being resolved before the Soviet intervention in autumn 1939. Economically, the state provided for the general welfare of the people; and in the interwar period Lithuanian culture achieved a new level of achievement.

Soviet domination, however, brought to an end Lithuanian independence. In one of the most brutal acts of aggression in our time, the Soviet Union invaded peaceful Lithuania in open defiance of internationally recognized treaties which were designed to preserve Lithuanian independence and territorial integrity. Mass deportations, executions, forcible collectivization of agriculture, nationalization of industry, general religious and cultural suppression in every form—all instruments of Communist imperialism—have been employed by the Soviets during the years of their domination over Lithuania. Thus, by sheer force Lithuanians have become a part of the Soviet prisonhouse of nationalities.

This 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence calls the attention of the world to Soviet imperialism and colonialism at its worst. I join with my colleagues in the prayer that soon will come the happy day of liberation when Lithuania again will be free with a government chosen by the people and dedicated to the service of the people.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] for reserving this hour to commemorate this day as a milestone in the fight for freedom of a great people.

February 16, 1958, marks the 40th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. It is very fitting that the Congress of the United States devote time to commend the Lithuanian people and to remind the world that Lithuania and its people are fighting and will still continue to fight for the reestablishment of complete independence and self-government.

Lithuania's valiant fight for liberty and independence is not of recent origin but the pages of her history are emblazoned with heroic battles for liberty since the 12th century. During the 16th century, Lithuania battled against the same Russian tyranny which envelops it today. In the 18th century, this valiant country suffered a decline which brought about complete Russian domination. This tyrannical yoke was inflicted for 120 years, but during that period 5 major revolts took place against its conqueror.

The people of this nation during intervals of time in the 19th century enjoyed the opportunity to exist as a free and independent people. World War I brought about an international situation which gave Lithuania a long-awaited opportunity to proclaim to the world that it is a free and independent nation. For more than 20 years as a free country, no nation has ever demonstrated its capacity and ability for self-government more than Lithuania. Its civic leaders brought

about long-needed land reformation, created and expanded industry, established an adequate transportation system, and enacted social legislation and an educational policy which could well be copied by other nations throughout the world. This great progress by a free nation continued up until World War II when Lithuania again became the victim of a powerful aggressor nation who succeeded in enslaving its people.

I have on former occasions spoken on the floor of this House outlining the infiltration duplicity and force used by the Communists to submerge Lithuania and I shall not repeat these sordid facts today. I can only say that the people of Lithuania will not be alone in their fight for freedom against the Soviet tyrants. Millions of others are today temporarily held under the yoke of Communist tyranny. They, along with the free nations of the world, including the United States, must keep up the fight not only to curtail the expanse of communism but to wipe its tyranny from the face of the earth and restore liberty and independence to the valiant and heroic people of Lithuania.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden] was chairman of the Special House Committee on the Investigation of the Katyn massacre. I had the privilege of serving with him and later serving upon the House committee investigating Communist activities among other satellite nations in Europe. His words carry great weight with us today.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fenton].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I have a great many people in my district who were born in Lithuania and many of Lithuanian extraction. I certainly want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the fine discourse he is giving us here today. I join with him in extending congratulations to the Lithuanian people for their persistence in trying to unloose the shackles of tyrants and in trying to reestablish their independence. I know that, like the Polish people, the Lithuanian people, too, will rise again to the place where they will enjoy independence.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is an old coal miner from a district adjacent to mine in the great State of Pennsylvania. You know that in his district, as in mine, there are many Americans of Lithuanian ancestry. As a doctor of medicine, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fenton] stands high in the esteem of his constituents, as he does in his capacity as their Representative in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kearney].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, along with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] and my other colleagues in the House, I, too, wish to extend my congratulations on the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to extend to the people of Lithuania on the 40th anniversary of their independence, February 16, greetings and our hope that the outstanding courage and gallantry they have so long exhibited will soon be rewarded. What should be a glorious national holiday for the people of the nation of Lithuania once again will be celebrated in secret in the shadow of the Russian military machine.

Seventeen years have intervened since the tragic events of June 1941, which saw thousands of Lithuanian patriots wrested from their homeland and exiled to Russian slave labor camps. Families were separated, executions, starvation, and hunger were commonplace and took their terrible toll. It was the sort of brutal action brought against the people of an unoffending nation which it is hard to imagine being initiated by any world power other than the Soviet Union. It is this sort of history which makes the Free World slow to accept the talk of Russian leaders in recent weeks as anything more than skillful propaganda.

We feel the deepest sympathy for the people of Lithuania. Though we are unable to give them anything more than our moral support in their political martyrdom, we will continue to support the principles daily being violated by the Soviets in their treatment of these people—the principles of national sovereignty and independence and the avoidance of force and violence as a means of settling international disputes. We hope and pray that these principles soon will triumph.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman from New York. As you know, Mr. Speaker, he is a retired general of the Armed Forces of the United States. Through the service of himself and his comrades, our liberties were preserved, and I hope the liberty and freedom of Lithuania will be nearer as a result.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader [Mr. McCormack].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] for getting this time today so that we might pause to conduct these exercises in celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day.

History shows that the Lithuanian people are one of the staunchest and stoutest fighters for freedom and independence. They have always championed the elementary rights of the individual, and throughout their modern history they have fought hard and ceaselessly for those fine democratic ideals against the forces of oppression and tyranny. In fact most of their modern history may be written in terms of unending struggles against their oppressors. For centuries they fought against Russia's autocratic regime. Their unyielding and uncompromising spirit, their firm resolve to cling to certain cherished ideals, and their steadfast belief in basic principles of Indo-Christian civilization have served them well in times of distress and despondency. During all that time they waited for

the chance to liberate themselves, and in 1918 they had that chance.

On February 16 of that year, 40 years ago today, even before the end of the First World War, they proclaimed their national political independence. In their historic homeland, they established a truly democratic government. That government lasted for more than two decades, and the people of Lithuania enjoyed for the first time in more than a hundred years the blessings of freedom. Unfortunately, soon after the outbreak of the last war the Lithuanians, through no fault of their own, once more found themselves in a desperate predicament, and their independence became one of the first casualties of that war. In mid-1940 the Red army moved into Lithuania and soon the country was annexed to the Soviet Union. Ever since then Lithuanians have been denied in their homeland both personal and national freedom.

Today, while we all gladly join Americans of Lithuanian descent in the celebration of this holiday, the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, the millions of Lithuanians in their homeland are not permitted to celebrate it, or even to talk or write about it. There they suffer under the tyrannical Communist dictatorship imposed upon them by the ruling international gangsters in Moscow. They live in dread of the secret police and they have been exiled by the thousands to the far and desolate corners of the Soviet Union. On this day, in commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day, it is a privilege to join with Lithuanians and with their descendants in the United States in a common prayer that Lithuanians in their homeland as well as in this land of liberty may quickly breathe the fresh air of freedom again.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that communism is going to be defeated by people who are willing to fight and die for liberty. Communism, as constituted, is going to be defeated in the minds of people who believe in God and his word and his law, as a result of which develops the way of life that we have here, and that every man and every woman, everywhere want, under their own law. Communism is going to be defeated, as evidenced by the brave people of Hungary, in those lands behind the Iron Curtain dominated by the Soviet Union, where countless millions of persons are longing for the day of freedom, and they are looking with hope to America to bring that freedom to them as quickly as possible.

Lithuania is one of those great countries where the people are imbued with that intense love of God, from which comes the intense desire for freedom. Communist dictators can never destroy that desire, because that desire was not created by man, and what man did not create man cannot destroy. Man may temporarily suppress but man can never destroy the inherent rights that we all possess as individuals, which come from God himself through his natural law. That is the great reservoir we have to capitalize. Our foreign policy should be connected up with that inherent de-

sire that we know exists in the minds of countless of millions of persons. What policy have we got if another Hungary happens? Suppose there is an uprising tomorrow in Lithuania, what is our policy? Suppose there is an uprising in Poland tomorrow, what is our policy? Suppose there is an uprising in East Germany, where there is contiguous territory between East Germany and West Germany of several hundred kilometers, and where the spark might happen that would bring about a conflagration for the restoration of liberty.

In the event of an uprising, suppose several hundred thousands of the Germans in Western Germany, the Bonn government, should cross the dividing line that exists now, cross as volunteers, what is the policy of our Government? Have we profited as a result of what happened in Hungary? And if it happened sooner or later in Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, East Germany, or any other Soviet-dominated country, have we a policy to capitalize on the situation which flows as a result of the inherent desire of men and women to possess what God has given to them, liberty and independence?

So, Mr. Speaker, while Lithuania and other countries are under the heel of the ruthless Communist dictator, the most ruthless type of dictatorship recorded in the known history of man, it is, in my opinion, only a matter of time until the people of Lithuania and other Communist-dominated countries will regain their liberty. But we must always be strong, not only militarily, but also we must be strong morally, because it is our moral strength that is going to enable us to engage in affirmative action that will defeat communism; and it is moral strength that is keeping the people of Lithuania and other Soviet-dominated countries alive today, their belief in God and their hope for early restoration of independence and liberty. They are looking to America for leadership, and America should not fail when that day comes.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman for his extremely fine statement in appreciation of Lithuania. I have very few Lithuanians in my district, but there are many in the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts; they make very wonderful citizens in this country. I have the greatest admiration for them.

Mr. Speaker, it behooves us to see that there is no effort in this great country of ours, made up as we are from many different foreign strains, to take away

our freedom of religion, to take away our freedom of action, to take away other freedoms we enjoy today in our own country. I have recently seen some signs of trying to set brother against brother in the United States. This, I think, is communistically inspired. That is one reason why I think the gentleman's speech commending Lithuania's continuing fight for freedom and independence is particularly timely.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

We have over 2 million Americans of Lithuanian ancestry who served in the Second World War and in Korea. No one in this assembly has done more for the American veterans than the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I would like to associate myself with my colleagues in this House in commemorating the 40th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, proud people never forget their independence day, and they always celebrate it with due solemnity. Perhaps no other day in the history of a people is as deeply venerated as is the day of their national independence. Just as the birthday is of distinct significance to the individual, so independence day is of utmost significance to free and independent nations.

Yet many free and independent nations celebrate their independence day as a matter of course because they live in freedom and take their independence for granted. But this is not so with peoples who have won their independence after centuries of stress and strife, after long and sacrificial efforts, and after suffering almost endless miseries and hardships. To such peoples the celebration of independence day means the reviving of old historic memories, retelling of episodes and events which led to the culmination of their independence and freedom. And if such people had the misfortune to lose their regained and fondly cherished independence, then its commemoration takes an additional meaning. It becomes the standard, the goal toward which they vow to work, even though it may mean sacrifice. Such is the significance of the commemoration of the Lithuanian Independence Day.

The Lithuanians were for centuries a sovereign, independent people in their historic homeland. Late in the 18th century they lost their independence, and their country became part of the Russian Empire. For more than 100 years they endured the harsh and oppressive regime of autocratic Czars, but they never relinquished their right to freedom, nor for a moment did they forget their goal—national independence. They dreamed of it, they planned their work in its attainment, and often they plotted against the Czarist regime. Their only real chance for freedom came only after the Russian Revolution of 1917. Then the Czar's regime collapsed, and the Lith-

uanians, feeling free, proclaimed their national independence in February of 1918.

From that historic day on, for more than 20 years, hard-working and patriotic Lithuanians labored lovingly and diligently to make their homeland one of the most prosperous, progressive and orderly democracies in Europe. All free peoples watched the industrious Lithuanians build their war-torn country as a model; they were glad and overjoyed to see Lithuanians succeed so well in their task. Not so, however, were the feelings of dictators and powerful oppressors in some neighboring countries. They seemed to be envious of Lithuanian freedom and prosperity, and were determined to put an end to that democratic show. The Soviet Union was Lithuania's most-feared neighbor. Unfortunately her grave apprehensions were justified, when early in World War II Lithuania was overrun by Soviet forces and annexed to the Soviet Union.

Since then, for more than 17 years, Lithuanians have been suffering under totalitarian dictatorship. They endured the oppressive Nazi overlords during part of World War II, but during most of the last 17 years they have suffered under Communist tyranny. Their once free country has been turned into a large prison house where everyone is in Communist bondage. Under these oppressive conditions they still retain their hope for freedom and liberty. Though they cannot celebrate their independence day openly, yet we all know that they cannot forget it. To them, even more than to those in the free world, it brings hope and fortifies their faith in their eventual freedom. We in the free world in celebrating the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, echo their genuine and irrepressible feelings and ardently hope that soon Lithuanians attain their goal—genuine freedom in their own homeland.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE MISSILE AND THE MIND

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, many have said that this session of Congress should be concerned with missiles, space, and atomic submarines. All these questions, and others like them, are of the greatest importance to the survival of this Nation as a free and independent entity.

It would be wrong, however, to equate these materials of war with permanent peace. They can prevent new aggression, but they cannot destroy the effects of past oppression. The missile can never replace the mind, for it is in the minds of men, and only there, that everlasting peace can become a reality.

Yesterday marked the 40th anniversary of the independence of a people. It is not an anniversary we can celebrate without a good deal of regret.

The people of Lithuania are proud and vigorous. For centuries they have struck back at overwhelming odds in a gallant, and oftentimes futile, fight for freedom. Since 1253 when Mindaugas the Great was crowned first king of Lithuania this small but vital country has waged a never-ceasing battle in defense of its sovereign rights.

Today 3 million Lithuanians live, or perhaps I should say exist, under the hobnailed boot of Communist dictatorship. For the brief space of 22 years the previous century-long rule of terror by Russia was lifted. Then in 1940, in abrogation of all the rules of international law and universal morality, the new rulers of Russia, to protect themselves, smashed this tiny nation—a giant crushing a delicate vase.

At a time when the conflict between the free and Communist worlds has reached a new stage, the experience of these oppressed peoples is particularly significant. To the so-called uncommitted nations of the world, I say, "Look to Lithuania—look at her citizens, look at her laws, look at her slaves. Look, and say this is not naked, unashamed Communist imperialism."

We are engaged in a great struggle. In that struggle missiles are important. The deterrent effect of ICBM's and IRBM's of hydrogen bombs and pestilence bombs are of great value. For what, after all, guides these men in the Kremlin? Fear and a never-satisfied thirst for power—a thirst only briefly slaked by the blood of their victims. So long as we can balance that thirst with fear of devastating power held by free men, they will not drink again.

But these are negative weapons to hold off new rapes of nationhood. They cannot, in themselves, do more than maintain the status quo. For this is a struggle not basically of missiles, but of minds. To win we must gain the allegiance of freedom-loving men and women around the globe.

The hard, the brutal, difference between the two ways of life is illuminated in the cold reality of Lithuania today. The stark terror, the murders, the concentration camps all scream their message. The many Lithuanians living in this country today attest to the kind of nation Lithuania could be. The blood of barbarism testifies to what it is.

In our country many Americans of Lithuanian origin have proved able and conscientious citizens, contributing much of their heritage and culture to their communities. Through such people as these is America growing, enriched by new customs and new ideas.

As free men and women we are bound by laws, not only of self-preservation, but of morality, to strive to the end that all peoples everywhere will enjoy the dignity of democracy. Abraham Lincoln said:

In giving freedom to the slaves we assure freedom to the free.

So long as the lamp of liberty is dark anywhere, our own light is in peril.

Security is not won by missiles alone. It is won by a steadfast determination that the minds of men must and will

be free. Lithuania today wears the collar of communism, but it no less capable of the contributing to freedom's cause.

The example of a proud people, jealous of their rights, shackled to the iron maiden of the Communist conspiracy carries a message of great impact for the minds of those uncommitted nations. The reality of present Communist imperialism, as epitomized in Lithuania should constitute a major weapon in the arsenal of democracy. Past colonialism may be a thorn pricking the memories of these peoples, but today's threat to freedom from the Kremlin is a sword of Damocles hanging over their heads, over their newfound independence.

As we celebrate the anniversary of that day in 1918 when this tiny nation declared its independence, we celebrate by renewed resolve; that these people and their enslaved compatriots behind the Iron Curtain shall know freedom once again, that their lamps of liberty shall once again be lighted and the darkness of despotism shall haunt their homes no more.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, Sunday will be Lithuanian Independence Day. To the people of Lithuanian descent it is both a day of joy and a day of extreme sadness. It is a day of joy, because history recalls that it was on February 16, 40 years ago, that started an era of happiness and freedom for Lithuania, an era of more than a score of years of independence to a little country that has been under Russian rule since 1795. It is a day of sadness, because the independence of their fatherland does not exist any more. The Soviet fist is today clenched tighter than ever over their country.

On this 40th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, we who live in liberty and freedom extend to the people of Lithuania our assurance that we shall continue to support them in their fight for liberation so that they may once again be free to enjoy freedom and peace.

We assure them that we have not forgotten their valiant fights of the past against tyranny and dictatorship, and we feel confident that the day will come again, as it did in 1918, when the people of Lithuania will rise in their wrath and break the yoke which the Soviets have placed around their necks. We know that the present Government of Lithuania is not one of the will of the people but one that has been imposed on them by brute force.

The history of Lithuania is one of struggle by a freedom-loving people to get along with their neighbors. She was ever ready to take upon herself even more than her just share; thus when the Nazi persecution of Jews began in Germany, and many Jews were looking for refuge, Lithuania, in response to an international appeal, admitted almost double the number of her legitimate quota. Then again, in the darkest hour of recent Polish history, when the German and Soviet armies were tearing Poland to pieces, Lithuania, albeit deeply wronged by Polish occupation of her capital, which Poland never returned to Lithuania, wholeheartedly offered asylum to

thousands of her adversaries, the Polish refugees fleeing now before the German and Soviet invaders. The history of Lithuania is also the story of a people that has been subjected to persecution at the hands of greedy nations who not only took control of its Government but also stifled religion by closing its churches, raided its library, expelled thousands from the country, drove thousands into slave labor and armed services, and chased into the forests other thousands of men and boys who refused to fight under the Germans and later under the Russians. These holdouts preferred to become guerrillas and to suffer undue hardships in order to carry on the harassment of the invaders.

The Lithuanians are fine people—industrious, conscientious, peace-loving, and loyal. These fine qualities are evident in the nearly 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent who are in this country, as well as in the 26,000 Lithuanian displaced persons who have found a haven in the United States.

I am happy that our Government adheres to its statement made on July 23, 1940, in which the United States protested against the annihilation of the 3 Baltic Republics by Soviet Russia.

To the people of Lithuania, and to their many friends and relatives, we say: Have faith; your country will again gain prominence and position in the world with the aid of your many friends here in the United States.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting, that in this week that marks the birthday of the Great Emancipator, and in this Chamber where once his voice was heard, we join in homage and recognition of the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

For the slavery that Lincoln abhorred so much was not one whit more evil than the slavery that has been forced upon the brave people of that little land.

The ideals of freedom for which Lincoln lived and died are the same ideals that burn fiercely in the breasts of Lithuanians everywhere, those fortunate enough to be breathing the free air of America and those now oppressed by the stifling bonds of communism.

Even a brief glance at the history of this tiny nation makes one feel humble, deeply respectful and greatly amazed at the courage and bravery of her people.

A victim of wars and oppression over the centuries; battered by Napoleon's retreating army and again by advancing Cossack hordes; tossed like a shuttlecock from Russian to German to Russian; her fertile acres stripped and unproductive; her literature and language supplanted by the godless mouthings of the Kremlin; her families torn apart and her people deported by the thousands.

One stands in awe and wonder, that this tiny country has been able to hold on to its identity, its people able to keep the torch of freedom still flaming brightly in their hearts.

In deep humility and with reverent hopes we salute Lithuania, her sons and daughters who walk proudly and unafraid in their adopted homeland, and those still writhing under communism's yoke. May we be inspired by their cour-

age and dedication, and as we stand today to honor their brief but glorious day of freedom—so may we stand tomorrow in mutual rejoicing over their final deliverance from the bonds of tyranny.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania was proclaimed an independent kingdom after 123 years of Russian rule. In November of 1918 the country became an independent republic. Lithuania overcame insurmountable difficulties in throwing off the yoke of over 120 years of Russian rule. As a member of the family of free nations she made remarkable progress in all fields of endeavor. But after World War II Russia incorporated Lithuania into the U. S. S. R. and, for 12 years, she has been hidden behind the Iron Curtain. Here today is the world's largest concentration camp whose frontiers are sealed off even with its neighbors and no contact with the outside world.

For centuries Lithuanians have had a reputation for successfully resisting amalgamation with the nationalities which have overrun their country. They have clung obstinately to their culture, religion, and ethnical entity. For 12 years now they have been completely blacked out. Even the pipeline running from the Roman Catholic Lithuania through Poland to the Vatican, which functioned through the 1939-40 Soviet invasion and the subsequent German occupation has become clogged.

Today only the peoples of the free world can commemorate this important anniversary and speak for these silenced people. And we must continue to speak for them until their independence is regained and they can once again speak for themselves.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Lithuania.

This nation is not a new one but dates back to many centuries as an outstanding military, political and cultural power in the eastern section of Europe.

The Soviet dictators have done their best to obliterate all traces of Lithuanian nationality and culture, but I believe the sparks of freedom still exist in the hearts of the Lithuanian people. They look to the United States as the leader of the free world to provide them the moral and spiritual support on which they rely for the perpetuation of their crusade for freedom. In the interests of freedom and independence we cannot fail them.

This is why Congress should speak up continually against the cruel Soviet terror tactics and colonization until every nation beyond the Iron Curtain is freed from the Soviet grasp and allowed to live without fear.

I am most gratified and honored to be among those Members of this body who speak against Russian attempts to communize Lithuania permanently. History is against the Soviets, as it has proven to us that the enslavement of people is doomed so long as the will for freedom and independence exists.

Lithuanian Americans have taken a very active part in speaking against the capture of their nation. The Lithuanian

American Council is the spokesman for nearly one million Lithuanian Americans here, and the council is to be commended for keeping alive the crusade for freedom in asking their many friends in Congress to pay tribute to Lithuanian independence. They have not forgotten the country of their birth.

May we hope that one day in the not too distant future, through the efforts of us in the free world, that Lithuania will once again be returned to her now silenced people.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Lithuania will be observed by freedom loving people everywhere on February 16 this year.

Because those of us who live in the United States hold so dear the blessings of freedom, we take this time in the House today to recall that little nation whose struggle continues, and I know I am joined by my colleagues in Congress in wishing her well today and always in the future, hoping she, too, may before too long enjoy those blessings of liberty and freedom with which we here are so richly endowed.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the many friends of Lithuania in Congress who are acknowledging the 40th anniversary of her independence which falls on Sunday next, February 16.

Lithuania, together with her Baltic neighbors, Estonia and Latvia, was one of the early victims of imperialistic Communist aggression in 1940 when the Soviet Union tore up the pacts of non-aggression and friendship she had signed with these three small countries and forcibly incorporated them as Soviet socialist republics in as naked a display of ruthless aggression as the modern world has ever seen. Be it to the credit of the United States Government, under both Democrat and Republican administrations, that this international rape has never been recognized and that we still maintain diplomatic relations with the representatives of the Baltic nations here in our own country.

I wish to pay particular tribute, Mr. Speaker, to the Lithuanian American Information Center and the Lithuanian American Council, Inc., which has labored tirelessly to keep the course of Lithuanian independence before the conscience of the free world. I likewise call attention to the fact that our Government has still evidenced its concern in the fate of the captive peoples and has reiterated its belief in their right of freedom and self-determination. The recognition of occasions such as the 40th anniversary should help to convince the people of occupied Lithuania that they are not forgotten and that our people believe that one day this anniversary will again be celebrated in freedom by the people of Lithuania itself.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, throughout their long and turbulent history Lithuanians have always struggled for their freedom. They have prized both personal and national freedom so highly that they have always been prepared to sacrifice all their worldly possessions and their lives in fighting for its attainment.

and preservation. Their history has been one continuous and strenuous struggle for this common goal; the attainment of personal as well as national freedom. However, even when they were prepared to defend their cherished freedoms with all physical and moral power they were able to muster, at times they were no match to forces infinitely larger and far more powerful. And because of this they lost their freedom in the late 18th century; by sheer power and strength of numbers they were overpowered, overwhelmed, and subdued by the Russians. Then for more than 100 years, until 1918, they were held down by the callous officials of their careless overlords. The Russians imposed their inefficient but stern and unrelenting regime upon the Lithuanians and they tried every means at their disposal to curb, stifle, and choke the Lithuanian spirit of nationalism, of freedom, and of liberty. But fortunately they were unsuccessful in their evil efforts. The unbending and unwavering Lithuanians withstood all oppressive measures and preserved their independent spirit and their love of freedom. In the end when they had the opportunity of freeing themselves from foreign yoke, they seized upon it and proclaimed their independence in February of 1918.

The independence thus regained was acclaimed everywhere as the just reward of a people richly deserving this long cherished prize. Thenceforth for more than 2 decades the Lithuanians in their historic homeland labored diligently, joyfully, and ceaselessly, and succeeded in making Lithuania one of the most prosperous and progressive democracies in Europe. Unfortunately, however, this happy situation was not to last long. The evil eyes of Lithuania's powerful neighbors seem to have watched life in free Lithuania with envy and jealousy. They were not disposed to tolerate a free Lithuania. They were determined to destroy it. This they did in 1940. In June of that year the Red Army of the Soviet Union marched into Lithuania, overran it, and then the country was annexed to the Soviet Union. Since those evil days unhappy Lithuanians have not known freedom; they have suffered, and are still suffering under Communist tyranny.

In the past while Lithuanians were enduring the oppressive foreign yoke in their homeland, many of them crossed the ocean and found themselves on these hospitable shores. Here they found refuge in freedom. Here they found the freedom for which their forefathers had fought for centuries in Europe. And in full freedom here they gave an excellent record of themselves in every field of endeavor. In business and industry, in the artistic, academic, and scientific fields, in the laboring forces, and in the fighting forces of this country, they have distinguished themselves and thus have contributed immensely toward the enrichment of our American civilization. They are noted for their loyalty to the institutions of this country and for their readiness to fight for the preservation of these institutions. In short they have become model citi-

zens of this great Republic. We are indeed proud of them, of their record, and accomplishments.

Today we are glad to join these Lithuanian-Americans in the celebration of the 40th anniversary of this independence day, the Lithuanian Independence Day. We know that many Lithuanians are not free to do this. The Lithuanians in their homeland are not permitted to celebrate it. But we also know that as long as those stouthearted and brave Lithuanians live in the hope of attaining their freedom, then the day may not be far off when they will enjoy it in their beloved homeland.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Moscow is irritated when we speak up for Lithuania.

It would like to have us forget, but that is impossible.

There is nothing in the Soviet bag of tricks that can silence the voice of the world's conscience.

Every year on this date we celebrate the anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Paying tribute to the spirit of her people; the spirit that can never be conquered by the atheistic materialism of communism. The Reds have occupied the physical area of Lithuania, but they can never take over its mind and heart.

The spontaneous uprising of the Hungarian people, and their tremendous courage against impossible odds, was a clear warning to Communists everywhere that they have failed. In every captive nation, this pressure for freedom is a force that cannot be held in check forever. Inevitably it will erupt and like a chain reaction, it will vaporize all tyrants and their evil works.

Year after year, on February 16, we rededicate ourselves to the cause of Lithuanian independence.

And there is nothing that the Communists can do to stop it.

Inexorably, the fundamental yearnings of people must be satisfied.

With increasing power, the tyrants become increasingly worried.

That is the paradox of communism.

The more material power they acquire, the less sure they become.

Where, in their record of cruelty and enslavement, is the answer to their fears?

Being soulless, communism has no eternal truths to sustain it.

On every February 16, the freedom bell reminds all men of the vindication that is coming.

But, to the uneasy overlords in the Kremlin, the bell does not have a happy ring. It tolls the warning of their doom, of the retribution from which there is no escape.

For communism is the most monstrous crime in the annals of history.

It has murdered millions.

It has tortured many more.

And the tragic irony is that the blood-brothers of Russian and Chinese communism have vented their hate and fury upon their own people first.

But when they reach out to destroy the soul and the mind of humanity that is the threat to all true life on earth.

In the tiny country of Lithuania, bordering on the vast land-mass of Soviet Russia, and presently occupied and over-

powered by Red troops, secret police, and a few traitors, there lives a people who can never be conquered.

Patiently they endure, strengthened by their faith in God, and by their love for the culture and the traditions of their land.

Encouraged by the fact that we have not forgotten them.

In every Lithuanian home, they think of their relatives, friends, and countrymen who have become American citizens living in a country whose example inspires everyone who yearns for freedom.

Because they have placed their trust and confidence in us, we cannot fail them.

In the Congress of the United States, on this day set apart to honor Lithuanian Independence Day we reaffirm our determination to work for the liberation of Lithuania and every captive country.

Knowing that our words will reach them, in spite of every Communist effort to keep us apart.

Lithuanians, we admire your spirit; we believe in your cause. We shall not rest until you are free.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, freedom speaks in many tongues. The great tragedy of our era is that she now must speak in a whisper in so many lands and languages. It is a testimonial to the deathless vigor of freedom, however, that her voice never has been silenced, even under the particularly cunning and cruel repression of Soviet communism.

As leaders of the Free World, it is important that we not forget where the spirit of liberty must live in hopeful hiding, as, for example, in Lithuania. This homeland of a people who have fought repeatedly for freedom, and stand ready to do so again when history provides a new opportunity of promise, no longer is an independent nation. It is fitting that we honor this people and this nation as the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of its independence approaches.

To those not of Lithuanian extraction, it is easy to forget that there was a free Lithuania. The Soviets pretend that it enjoys a certain autonomy within the U. S. S. R., but it has been swallowed, although not digested, by the Russian Bear.

In that land that was and is Lithuania, however, many hearts are buoyed by the conviction that there will be another day to match the day now being recalled, February 16, 1918, when a sturdy people again found independence—the status of an entity in the community of nations which Lithuania had known as early as the 13th century.

There was a free Lithuania for two decades—two decades of substantial progress which reflected the energy and inherent capacity of the Lithuanian people. This was to come to an end with World War II. The Red Army extinguished the main flame of Lithuanian independence, but the pilot light remained aglow—an inspiration to those of Lithuanian blood wherever they might find themselves in the world.

Now, another anniversary approaches, and Lithuania remains enslaved. It is an unfortunate fact that we cannot offer, even from our position as leader of the

free peoples, a promise of early liberation. We can recall with some satisfaction, however, that the United States never has recognized the Soviet annexation, and we can resolve anew to make no compromise with tyranny, to the end that the smaller nations now in captivity behind the Iron Curtain once again shall rise in independent dignity.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, one of the factors that makes our country great is the blending of foreign cultures into the multicolored stream of American life. The reasons that have encouraged immigration to our free land are many: Perhaps the most tragic has been the loss of freedom and human dignity in the Old World. This was true of Lithuania.

When Lithuania was overrun by the Czars many Lithuanians, finding religious liberty and freedom more precious than home ties, fled to America. The ones who remained behind continued to fight for a free Lithuania. Their work was not to be in vain; for independence was finally achieved on February 16, 1918. Although their homeland was once again free, many Lithuanians decided to stay here in their adopted land.

Lithuania's loss was America's gain. Ever grateful for the freedom and opportunity the country provided, the Lithuanian immigrants became outstanding American citizens.

America has been grateful for the contributions. In all parts of the country American Lithuanians have provided leaders in their chosen field of endeavor. The list of outstanding Americans of Lithuanian descent is long. Mikas Petrauskas, Anna Kaska and Shirley White are familiar names to theater lovers. Jack Sharkey, Jack Goodman, Vito Tamulis were prominent sports personalities. Many more have, and are serving faithfully in, public office throughout the country. All these and many more have enriched and ennobled American life.

Although Americans first, they have a natural concern for the land of their forebears. Once again their native land is not free. Today, on the 40th anniversary of the independence, Lithuanian hearts are sad. They know that today will be one of sad memories and unfulfilled hopes in their homeland.

All Americans join with their Lithuanian friends in commemorating the anniversary of Lithuanian Independence. They take this opportunity to express with them sympathetic concern for their countrymen in the enslaved homeland, and to join them in their prayers for genuine freedom and peace.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 16 is the 40th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence.

We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, and for these ends to

practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples, have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.

Thus, a new chapter of truly sincere words of good will in the spirit of Christian doctrine had been added in the field of international relations. This beautiful document was signed on the 26th day of June in 1945. Since then, time and again it has been quoted, commented, and a new generation of children, from all walks of life and from all over the world, have studied these words and many of them have left their schools with the thought to better international relations along the lines of the above United Nations Charter. Generations from now mankind will study the above quoted lines but only a very few of them will ever learn the true historical aspect that was the background which led the signatories to affirm their signatures to this document.

Whoever has read the preamble of the U. N. Charter undoubtedly will be under the impression that it was written by men who believed in the good of the human race. They will firmly believe that those who signed the document were idealists of good human nature, excellent standing, and beyond reproach. This, unfortunately, was not the fact. And today most of us know so. We know that one delegate to the San Francisco Conference came there like the Trojan Horse men in 1195 B. C., and that he and his successors have obstructed the work of the U. N. ever since. And we do know also, that as long as the "distinguished gentlemen" from the Soviet Union remain participating members of the U. N., no good will ever come out of it.

Our great Woodrow Wilson, in an address to the United States Senate on a World League of Peace, had said:

I am proposing government by the consent of the governed.

When we formed the United Nations, did we ask the people of the Soviet Union whether their representatives sent to San Francisco came there by consent of the 200 million people comprising Soviet Russia? No, we know that these representatives were sent merely to represent the henchmen known as Stalin and company. Wilson's ideals embodied in the League of Nations have gone forgotten. And yet the entire conception of the U. N. was nothing but a replica of Wilson's League of Nations. Are we that shortsighted not to see this?

Following Wilson's idea of "the recognized right of nations to self-determination," as laid down in his famous 14 Points, Lithuania's Declaration of Independence was signed on February 16, 1918. She enjoyed her freedom until Soviet troops marched into that country at the outbreak of World War II. Since that time Lithuania, with its gallant people, has become a doomed country, just as doomed as Latvia and Estonia.

None of the members of the U. N. first conference in San Francisco had courage enough to demand the full independence and sovereignty of that little state that came into existence in the year 1200 A. D. During the Middle Ages Lithuanians had established a powerful and independent state in Europe. For centuries they succeeded in opposing a German drive to the east and vice versa they protected Europe from Mongolian and Tartar hordes. They furnished a power and a government behind which the eastern Slavs could live in peace and safety with a freedom that was unknown in Russia. They encouraged education and tolerance and the part they played in the general development of European civilization was great. But they were forgotten when the first chapter, "We the peoples of the United Nations," was drafted.

It is a shame to think of it when we witness how new countries come into existence. Countries that one has never heard of. Countries in the Middle East with no historical background, and countries that had no more than 15 college graduates when the U. N. declared their independence. Should there not be some priority? Should the blood spilled through centuries in the fight for freedom by the Lithuanian people not be vindicated, at least by some encouragement?

Mr. Speaker, for years I have been pleading to do something about the sealed fate of the Baltic States. Let us not lose our face as we have lost it on many occasions in the past. Today on the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence let us once again think about that little nation with its proud history and ask Mr. Khrushchev: "How long do you intend to keep these people enslaved?"

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the people of Lithuania occurs on the 16th day of February, 1958. The United States recognized the sovereignty of Lithuania in 1922. Since that day Lithuania has been the victim of Soviet occupation and annexation. If this dreadful occurrence had not taken place, the United States would have had a free, democratic and friendly ally in the Government of Lithuania. Here in the United States one needs but to know his neighbor of Lithuanian descent to realize that had Lithuania not been the victim of Communist aggression it would have been among the leaders of the world in social, economic, cultural, and political progress in the interest not only of its own citizens but of all people.

We can only hope and pray that in the not too distant future the shackles of the Communists will be broken and Lithuania will take its rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 40th anniversary of the Lithuanian declaration of independence. I am glad to join with the nearly one million Lithuanian-Americans in celebration of this anniversary—which cannot be observed by the peoples of Lithuania, who have been silenced and subjected to the tyrannical rule of Soviet Russia. Our Nation, for

which the concepts of freedom and humanity have been a guiding light, views with sadness the present plight of the Lithuanian people, and looks to the time when their independence day will celebrate a vibrant living freedom.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago, on February 16, 1918, the independence of Lithuania was declared, after a great many years of forced annexation to the Russian Empire, and this independence was recognized by several free countries, including the United States. But this situation was comparatively short lived, and because of its geographical location, unfortunately, close to the Soviet Union, Lithuania was among the first victims of the tentacles of communism.

The Soviet Union, by various vicious means, placed and held its yoke of oppression upon the heroically rebellious and frustrated people of Lithuania. Then in the farcical so-called free election held in 1940 the citizens of Lithuania were compelled to go to the polls and forced under Communist-controlled circumstances to vote for a single list of candidates—this during a time when the Soviet secret police and the Red army were terrorizing the freedom-loving people of Lithuania. The result of this election was a Soviet-dominated Parliament, which promptly met and passed a resolution humbly requesting that Lithuania be admitted into the Soviet Union. The Supreme Soviet feverishly granted this request and announced on August 3, 1940, that Lithuania was declared to be a part of the Soviet Union. The United States has held fast to its refusal to recognize this absurd and fiendish annexation, and we continue to give the gallant people of Lithuania our moral support in hopes and prayers that the day will not be long coming when peace, freedom, and independence will again be restored to Lithuania and other oppressed territories behind the Iron Curtain. Our best wishes go out to them today.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Lithuania.

Today, all of the friends of free Lithuania pause to pay tribute to the freedom-loving Lithuanian people behind the Iron Curtain who are not free. These 3 million enslaved Lithuanians are daily denied liberties and freedoms which we in America often take for granted.

We in Cleveland are proud of the large segment of our population who are of Lithuanian extraction. They have made a tremendous contribution to the civic life of our community. In their diligent work and provident thrift, in their respect for the Constitution and the laws of our community, they are exemplary citizens. They have every right to be proud of their culture and heritage. It is well that we share their concern for the welfare of their less fortunate relatives and friends who remain in Lithuania.

On Sunday, February 16, over 1,000 Americans of Lithuanian descent will attend a program in the WHK Auditorium in Cleveland to further commemorate this 40th anniversary of Lithuanian

Independence under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Council in Cleveland.

In this way each year, much is done to keep alive the spirit of Lithuanian independence until the restoration of freedom and democracy in their homeland is finally achieved.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, during most of their modern history Lithuanians have suffered under various alien regimes. All of these regimes have been oppressive, but the Russians, who ruled over Lithuanians since late 18th century, were intolerable and totally unbearable. In February of 1918 that heavy yoke was overthrown and the Lithuanians regained their national political independence. For almost 150 years prior to that date, Lithuanians had dreamed and planned, and worked for the realization of that goal, and now that they had attained it, they were determined to maintain it, and defend it against all comers. For two decades they were a united people and with the help and encouragement of friends abroad, they rebuilt their country, and shaped their democratic government to suit their modest needs. In the course of two decades Lithuania became a respected member of the European family of nations.

But the rise of the totalitarian dictators proved to be fatal to small independent nations and Soviet Communists would not allow little Lithuania to enjoy the luxury of freedom and other amenities of democratic rule. Early in the course of World War II Lithuania was overrun by the Red army and the country was annexed to the Soviet Union. In mid-1940 Lithuanians lost their national independence which they had treasured for 40 years and today they still suffer under the unbearable rule of Communist Russia. They are forced to endure this tyranny but they live in the hope that some day their country will again be free from the Soviet tyranny. In commemorating the 40th anniversary of their independence day we all ardently hope that that day will not be too far off, for the love of liberty which is characteristic of these great people cannot be quenched. It is something that is dear to their hearts and it is their tradition, handed down from generation to generation, that no sacrifice is too great to be made on the altar of freedom.

The Lithuanians will continue their struggle for liberty and they will continue to receive the support of the citizens of all freedom-loving nations. The example which they have set the world in the past has been an inspiration to everyone and it will be cherished by this nation which is mighty in soul and which is indestructible. It is a privilege to praise the courage of such people and offer them the hand of friendship.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago the Lithuanian people threw off the yoke of oppression after 120 years of Czarist rule. Thereafter the citizens of Lithuania worked industriously and successfully to create a modern democracy. All of these hopes and all of this hard work was brought to naught a short 20 years later by the cruel heel

of Soviet and Nazi aggression. Although the Lithuanian State has been extinguished for the time being, Lithuanian devotion to liberty and to freedom serves as a beacon light to all of us in these troubled times.

It is indeed tragic that a people who for hundreds of years have been devoted to the causes of freedom and to Christianity have been so cruelly subjected to oppression and hardship. Our hearts go out to this brave people, and we only hope that the time will soon arrive when once more the Lithuanian State will take its place among the free democracies of the world.

A lesson can be learned from Lithuania by all those who think that they can do business with the Russians. Only 18 short years ago Soviet Russia in the Treaty of Moscow recognized the sovereignty and independence of Lithuania without reserve and renounced all sovereign rights ever possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory. This treaty was not even as good as the paper on which it was written. This was only one more instance of Russian perfidy, and yet the Russians still protest against Western imperialism and Western colonialism.

We can only fervently hope and pray that this great people will soon be able to throw off its shackles.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, just 40 years ago, on February 16, 1918, the independent Baltic Republic of Lithuania was founded as a democratic and sovereign state. Its independence, however, was shortlived. It lasted a little more than two decades until the beginning of World War II when Lithuania was occupied by Soviet Russia. It still remains an occupied country suffering under the brutal yoke of communism.

The Kremlin leaders are constantly denouncing colonialism and are posing as ardent champions of the oppressed and downtrodden small nations. At the same time, Moscow has subjugated more small nations than all the colonial powers ever did and certainly in more brutal ways. One need only look at Lithuania as an example of Russian tyranny practiced against a small people. Ruthless suppression of freedom, liquidation of its national independence, destruction of culture and religion, deportation of many thousands of Lithuanians to slave labor camps, severance of all contacts with the Free World and their kinsmen living there—these are some of the cruel achievements of Lithuania's Russian overlords.

Notwithstanding all of this suffering and enslavement, the people of Lithuania continue to strive for freedom and to hope for liberation of their country. Each year on the occasion of their glorious but not forgotten day of independence, they wait for a word of spiritual and moral encouragement from the freedom-loving people of America. It is to us that their eyes and their hearts turn for expressions of friendship, for signs of sympathetic understanding. Let us give them this desired encouragement in the fullest possible measure.

On this occasion we express our solidarity with the Lithuanian people. We pledge ourselves not to forget them in

their tragic plight during these dark days. We hope and pray for their early liberation. We send our greetings and our wishes that they may live to see their nation restored to full independence and to its rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, all men unite in praise of courage. It is proper therefore to celebrate the courage of the Lithuanian people on this the 40th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania.

The first information about Lithuania comes from the 10th century. Many tribes and independent groups of the Baltic area had been welded into the single state of Lithuania. From this beginning Lithuania advanced, during the Middle Ages, until its boundaries extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea. It became one of the great nations of Europe. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that it was of considerable importance in the history of western civilization that the courageous Lithuanian rulers were able to withstand the pounding waves of the Tartar hordes which threatened to overrun Europe.

Although the power of Lithuania declined rapidly until the state was absorbed first by Poland and later by Russia, the people clung valiantly to their traditions, language, and religion. Even the harsh Czarist efforts to stamp out the language and the cruel deportation of large numbers of the people to Siberia failed to destroy the tenacious spirit of freedom.

None but the brave deserve the fair.

And the fair was liberty. Finally on February 16, 1918, during the German occupation Lithuania proclaimed her independence from Russia. For a period of 20 years the wine of freedom invigorated the people, and substantial progress was made in political, economic, and cultural fields. Lithuania assumed her rightful place in the family of nations.

The independence of Lithuania came to an end during the Second World War with the invasion of the Germans in 1941, and in 1944 the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union. The chains of Russian bondage are heavy, but the Lithuanians have not ceased to hold their heads high.

We join today with the million American citizens of Lithuanian descent to celebrate this anniversary and to express our hope and faith in their eventual deliverance.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today is a historic and memorable day for the people of Lithuania. Forty years ago, on February 16, 2 million Lithuanians, who had for generations clung to their ancient traditional tenets, to the high ideals of democracy, freedom and independence, proclaimed their national independence. Ever since this small people had been forced to accept the Russian rule and acquiesce to the annexation of their country by Russia, they had thought, planned, and even plotted against the government of their overlords in Lithuania, but they simply did not have the physical power to do it. Toward the end of the First World War, when that decrepit regime col-

lapsed, the Lithuanians, along with a large number of other national groups of Russian empire, felt themselves free and asserted their independence.

Today's celebration of that event, the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, is marked with mixed feelings; it is charged with mixed emotions. It brings forth memories of joy and glad tidings which accompanied the proclamation of independence and signalized happier days. This celebration also brings grief and sorrow when we think of the fate of millions of unfortunate Lithuanians who once more find themselves under the harshest and most brutal of tyrannical forces, heartless Communist totalitarianism. While we on this memorable day celebrate that event, we remain fully and keenly conscious of the sad lot that has fallen to Lithuanians in their country. And on this day we once more express our heartfelt desire that soon they will regain their freedom and enjoy it in their homeland.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 16, will mark the 40th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the Republic of Lithuania. Since the House will not be in session on that day, I would like to join today with my colleagues in calling attention to that important anniversary.

Human values and desires have always played a vital role in shaping the course of history. While technological inventions and material progress may influence the shape and form of human institutions, it is the human spirit which sparks the destiny of man.

In an age when our attention is preoccupied with scientific achievement, when new and terrifying weapons appear to be the only determinants of the future of man, we must not forget the age-old lesson. The human spirit is still the ultimate weapon in any global conflict. Men, rather than the mechanical weapons developed by them, will decide who shall be the winner in the struggle between freedom and totalitarianism.

For this reason, it is proper that we pause today in our legislative deliberations to pay tribute to the indomitable spirit of the people of Lithuania, whose courageous deeds give ample testimony of their devotion to freedom. The people of Lithuania have bravely resisted all Soviet attempts to convert them to the Communist outlook and way of life. They continue to long for the day when liberty and national independence will be restored to them.

On this the 40th anniversary of their declaration of independence, let us join the people of Lithuania in their hope that their nation will soon again take its rightful place in the ranks of the free nations of the world.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, the celebration of Lithuania's 40th anniversary of independence is an occasion of such significance in the annals of human endeavor that I am proud to share in it. The spirit of Lithuania has survived vicissitudes of such magnitude that a people of lesser fortitude, of lesser moral stamina, of lesser attachment for the ideals which we hold most high would have succumbed long since. For the

Lithuanians, however, not only survival but an inspiring example of an epic tradition has been their contribution to an admiring world; and this throughout adversity extreme and prolonged.

The sustained story of Lithuania's spirit of independence, which has endured despite innumerable unfortunate ramifications of history, stands as a beacon to all oppressed peoples. The anniversary we celebrate, dating as it does from the reestablishment of this doughty Baltic Republic after World War I, marks not only the birth of this freedom-loving, rightfully proud, and spiritually undivided nation in 1918. It marks too the rebirth of a liberty which, though lost as a nation for centuries, was never dead in the hearts, the annals, and the vision of the Lithuanian people. Their rightful heritage was but restored to them—as we unflinchingly trust that it will be once again restored.

After nearly 800 years of domination by rich, powerful, envious, and belligerent neighbors, this ancient race was able to maintain its identity, preserving throughout its distinct language and literature, its ideals. Indomitable of soul, unconquerable of faith in its restoration, these people whose realm once extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea, became once again a sovereign and united country, 40 years ago today.

What has transpired since the gloom of World War II descended upon humanity is but another shadow across the page of history. Nonrecognition by the United States of the Soviet Union's attempt at absorption of this fortitudinous people is evidence in itself of the faith which the Lithuanians have inspired, the honor which they have earned.

With such a history as theirs for a foundation, Lithuanians today, despite temporary control of a Goliath, may face the future with the inspiration and the confidence of a David. We applaud their tenacity, their vigor, and their steadfast belief in the ultimate triumph of the right.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, it is my wish to mark the forthcoming 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Lithuanian people of February 16, 1918. At this time I join with the many friends of this once-free nation who have pledged their faith and efforts for the restoration of its independence.

Lithuania flowered in freedom for 22 years after World War I until 1940, when the Soviet Union overran the little Baltic country and commenced ruthless efforts to stamp out its identity. The friends of Lithuania, by their efforts, are keeping before the world this reminder of Soviet brutality and imperialism and are keeping alive the desire of millions of Lithuanian peoples for freedom.

In this age when freedoms constantly are under pressure, we are grateful for this inspiring example of resistance and determination. The cause of Lithuania is the cause of all captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain who have not surrendered their desire for freedom and liberty to the tyranny of communism.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying trib-

ute today, on the 40th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence, to a gallant Lithuanian nation which is today enslaved, but not defeated.

Those of us who had the privilege of serving on the House Committee on Communist Aggression had the opportunity to hear firsthand the authentic accounts of the brutality of the Communist forces which invaded and occupied Lithuania—and of the courage, patriotism, and spirit of the Lithuanian people in resisting the forcing upon them of Communist ideology and domination.

The lesson that is to be derived from those tragic days should never be forgotten by us or by the Free World. It teaches us the treachery and duplicity of the Communists and the futility of reliance upon their word. The example which the Lithuanian people gave the world in their resistance to tyranny and in their loyalty to the ideals of freedom and democracy certainly needs to be emulated by all of us who work and dedicate ourselves to the cause of a just and lasting peace.

I join in extending my congratulations to this fine and brave nation and in wishing for them the freedom and independence which they seek and which must, undoubtedly, be restored to them if the Free World is to survive.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, two score years ago, on February 16, after more than 120 years of foreign domination, Lithuania proclaimed its independence. For 23 happy years until the Nazi occupation of 1941 Lithuania prospered under her democratic form of government and became a respected member of the world community. Then in 1944, Soviet Russia swallowed up the Baltic Republics.

The terror tactics employed by the Soviets to enslave the Lithuanian people shocked the American people. However, despite these methods of persecution and deportation, the Reds have failed to extinguish the desire for freedom in the brave country. The Communists themselves were first to admit that after the Hungarian revolution in late 1956, repercussions were felt in Lithuania. Once again the nationalists were a cause for concern for the Red regime.

Today, on the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, the American people have an opportunity to denounce anew the inhumane methods of Soviet tyranny and to express their sympathy for the brave and long-suffering Lithuania. All freedom-loving Americans are confident that Soviet despotism will one day come to an end and we hope and pray that that day may be soon.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it was 40 years ago this week that Lithuania joined the family of free nations as an independent, democratic state. The reestablishment of the Lithuanian state came after nearly two centuries of bondage that began when Russian legions swarmed over the country in 1795.

Not a people to grovel before any conqueror, the Lithuanians revolted three times in the 19th century and again early in the 20th century against the might of the czars. This same people earlier in their history had demonstrated their

unquenchable love of liberty by battling against the Tartars and Huns.

Imbued with this centuries-old tradition of devotion to freedom, Lithuania was able on February 16, 1918, to proclaim its independence from Russia. This Baltic nation began taking giant strides in industry, in farming, in education, and in the arts.

Then, in June, 1940, the Soviet Union, following the pattern of conquest laid down by the czars, broke its peace treaty of 1920 with its Lithuanian neighbor and once again the yoke of Russian tyranny was clamped down on the proud state of Lithuania.

Remembering the fierceness with which the Lithuanians had fought against past enslavement, the Soviet invaders deported hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians from their homes and farms to the vast darkness of Siberia.

And so for 18 years, Lithuania has been a nation in chains, a nation where freedom is only an unextinguishable spark in the national soul.

But as long as this ember of freedom glows, there is hope for Lithuania and the other nations in the shackles of Soviet imperialism. I would tell the Lithuanian people today that they are not forgotten. One day, the chains forged by the conqueror will melt before the torch of liberty.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, do we not hear the desperate cries of the subjugated people of Lithuania? Have we forgotten what crimes have been perpetrated against this martyred people by the Soviet Union? Do we not see in the fate of Lithuania a manifestation of the complete evil of atheistic communism? Mass deportation, slavery, and liquidation have taken place in an effort by the Soviet Union to eliminate the Lithuanian state, its culture, and its religion. We can only imagine what sufferings and what humiliations must have been endured, and are still being endured, by this valiant people.

No, we and the entire Free World have not forgotten. We cannot forget. We work and we pray for the eventual glorious liberation of Lithuania and all other enslaved peoples.

On February 16 we celebrate the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence. After more than a century of domination by Czarist Russia, Lithuania assumed her rightful role in the ranks of the free nations of the world, in 1918. Yet even as we celebrate the anniversary of its independence, we note sadly the 18th anniversary of its enslavement by the Soviet Union. In having endured 18 years of oppression we might sympathetically understand if their hope had been replaced by despair, and their faith had been replaced by bitterness. Yet, we know that this is not the case. The light of their hope and the strength of their faith has never diminished. The danger is rather that the rest of the world might forget, might despair, or might lose faith.

For this reason, on February 16 and on every day of the year, we should have some reminder of our responsibility to the tortured peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

I propose that every time we read a newspaper born of our free press—every time we vote in our free elections—and every time we speak with complete freedom expressing either approval or disapproval of any phase of our society, we do so in full awareness of the terrible fact of our time—that millions of our fellow human beings are denied these basic freedoms of expression.

We cannot rest, we cannot cease to work, and we cannot cease to pray that soon Lithuania—and all other enslaved peoples, including the subjugated people of Russia—will find the strength to throw off the terrible weight and brutality of communism and return to the family of free nations.

Mr. McVEY. I deem it an honor to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the gallant nation of Lithuania, which, after more than 100 years of subjugation by Russia, proclaimed its independence on February 16, 1918. Her status as a free country was of short duration, but during that period her progress in all fields of endeavor was outstanding. The independence for which her people fought so hard and long came to an end in 1940 when Russia, in violation of its treaties with Lithuania, seized and occupied that country again. Since that time there has been no freedom in Lithuania, and the 40th anniversary of independence will not be celebrated in the homeland.

We Americans have not forgotten the Lithuanians. We are mindful of the tragic events that brought about the enslavement of their peaceful nation, and we will never approve of its occupation by the Russians. We salute the courageous people of Lithuania and assure them of our continued interest in their welfare. It is my fervent hope and prayer that Lithuania will soon throw off the yoke of Communist aggression and once again rejoin the family of free nations.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Lithuania. Upon gaining independence, Lithuania maintained it for 22 years until that country was occupied by the Soviet armed forces which have kept the freedom-loving people of Lithuania in bondage to the present day.

There can be no public celebration of this 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence in present-day Lithuania where the Soviet Communists are the masters. But the people of Lithuania and of the other Baltic States, Latvia and Estonia, have not given up hope that their prayers for freedom will be answered and that liberation will come.

Today, life in the Baltic States is hard and difficult, testing the courage and resourcefulness of every man, woman, and child who must live under Communist tyranny. The following letter from a factory worker of Riga, Latvia, presents a factual account of life in the Baltic States under Communist oppression:

You wish to know how we live? Well, the upper class, i. e., Russian officials and officers of the armed forces, as well as Latvian Communists in high positions, live very well.

But the majority of the people, including factory workers, do not really live, but struggle like nudes in a nettle bush. Wages are very low, amounting to 600 rubles per month in average for the majority of skilled workers, while beginners and unskilled workers make not more than 250 rubles a month. Hospital aids are paid 300-350, stenotypists 400, and nurses 450 rubles a month. Workers with exceptional skill may earn as much as 1,000 rubles, but their number is not great. Prices are still exorbitant.

Then follows a lengthy quotation of prices for foodstuffs and commodities, and descriptions of the various hardships to which consumers are subjected in their daily struggle for physical survival.

A man's suit of very low quality costs 455 to 520 rubles. Such a suit, containing hardly any wool, wears out in no time. The upper crust, such as executive officers, factory bosses, and functionaries of the party, are being served in secret by men's-wear cooperatives where their clothes are made to order by skillful tailors for 1,800 to 2,500 rubles per unit. They also can afford to buy woolen cloth of good quality on the black market for up to 500 rubles per meter.

To live comfortably, one needs an income of 2,000 rubles per month. But such earnings are accessible only to members of the Communist upper class. There are some who earn even much more than that. Kainberzins (first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party) for instance, derives a monthly income of 6,000 rubles, in excess of his basic salary, and other income from various sources. In contrast, the average Latvian worker must balance the family budget, as far as that is possible, by making everybody in the family—wife, children, and grandparents—seek some gainful occupation. Apart from honest work, pilfering of factory property and produce, which we workers call fencing, has become an inevitable and important source of income. Stealing is everybody's business in Soviet society, being practiced by high executives as well as simple workers. The stolen goods we sell on the black market, to complement our meagre diet. And why not, since we ourselves are dependent on the black market for acquiring indispensable goods at exorbitant prices? Pilfering and black market operations do not cause us any pangs of conscience, for we say to ourselves: Since the Communists exploit us without mercy, there is no obligation to hold their property sacred.

If a worker is caught stealing, he will be sentenced to hard labor for a number of years. As for the sleek bureaucrats, they know how to get away with murder. The Latvian workers are filled with hatred against their exploiters, and their devices for imposing unbearable production norms and socialist competitions. These norms are being raised constantly, leading in actual fact to lowering of wages. The trade unions of Mr. Voltmanis (boss of Latvian trade unions) are nothing but yellow organizations, subservient to their superiors and afraid to do anything for the benefit of the workers. The Latvian workers hold them in dire contempt, just as they despise the accursed Russian overlordship, and the arbitrary regime of the Communist Party.

NEPZANS.

This letter was published in the November issue of the Stockholm Latvian Socialist periodical paper Briviba.

The American people join with the people of Lithuania and those of Lithuanian ancestry on this 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Lithuania, in the hope that the Lithuanian people shall soon be liberated from their oppressors and once

again gain their rightful place in the Free World as independent citizens of an independent Lithuania.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the course of their long history, particularly during the last several hundred years, Lithuanians have seldom had the privilege of enjoying the blessings of peace and liberty in their homeland. They have done their best to live in peace and to maintain their freedom, but their more powerful, envious, and aggressive neighbors often had evil and expansionist designs on Lithuania. This desire for expansion on the part of Lithuania's neighbors has been and remains the principal cause of her woes. In the midst of long periods of subjugation and servitude, Lithuanians enjoyed freedom and independence, for a short period during the interwar years, a period long enough to prove to the Free World that they were fully deserving of national independence, but hardly long enough to make their small country a bastion against the darkness of communism.

On February 16, 1918, after suffering under Czarist autocracy for more than 100 years, Lithuanians proclaimed their national independence. That act, the fact of proclaiming their freedom, caused great joy not only to liberated Lithuanians but also to their friends everywhere. Those friends helped Lithuanians in the difficult task of rebuilding and remodeling their country and its institution to suit their modest tastes and desires. And in the short time allotted to them they were eminently successful in this great task. In 1940, however, soon after the outbreak of World War II, their independence was fatally endangered. Soon it was swallowed in the Communist flood. Their country was overrun by the Red army in June of 1940 and then incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Since then, unfortunate Lithuanians have neither national or individual freedom; and under the almost unbearable yoke of unrelenting Communist regime, they do not even have the freedom to lead a decent life. Under such abominable circumstances it is of course impossible for them to celebrate their sacred national holiday, their independence day. We in the Free World and in this country celebrate it in due solemnity and give a resounding echo to their genuine patriotic sentiments.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has become the custom in Congress each year to pay tribute to the people of Lithuania. February 16, 1958, will mark the 40th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence.

Unfortunately only Lithuanians now residing in the Free World can commemorate this anniversary and speak for a silenced people. Let it be known that all Americans, whether of Lithuanian descent or not, have not forgotten them in their present plight.

Lithuania overcame insurmountable obstacles in throwing off the yoke of nearly 120 years of Russian domination. For a period she took her place among the free nations of the world and made remarkable progress. During the years 1918-40 Lithuania received the recogni-

tion of the other free nations for her cultural, educational, and economic growth.

We all hope that within the near future Lithuania will once again be able to take her rightful place among the nations of the world.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to join with my colleagues in the commemoration of the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, which will fall on Sunday, February 16.

In past years we have felt the deepest sympathy for the plight of Lithuania. A small and peaceful nation, it fought valiantly for freedom, and—having achieved it—worked hard to gain great progress in land reform and education during the few short years before it was once again enslaved by the ruthless Soviet military machine; an occupation so harsh that only a handful of Lithuanians have been allowed to travel out of the country since 1939 and only the briefest reports concerning conditions within Lithuania are available.

All of our Christian teachings, our principles of democracy, our deepest conviction of human worth, are outraged by the Lithuanian story, and we are always more appreciative of our own freedom and good fortune after remembering Lithuanian Independence Day.

But this February, after the appearance of the Russian sputnik, the plight of Lithuania has a new and ominous meaning. The Russians' "stars" in the night sky serve, as nothing else could, to announce the tremendous power and driving ambition of the Soviet; and while we hail the remarkable progress of Russia—her great strides forward in industry, in education, and particularly in science—the memory of Lithuania does nothing to reassure us about the ambitions and aims of this military colossus. Rather it suggests plainly what may be the fate of any peaceful, prosperous nation if the real significance of Lithuanian Independence Day is forgotten.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me to revise and extend my remarks, I rise to join with many of my colleagues in this House, to take notice of the significance to free people everywhere of Lithuanian Independence Day, which will be observed on February 16, to mark the 40th anniversary of Lithuania winning her independence from Russia.

This year, although Lithuania today is not free, it seems to me that this anniversary has greater significance than ever before.

It is symbolic of the eternal flame, the yearning for freedom, that burns in the breasts of all men, that although Lithuania's status as a free and independent republic was comparatively short lived, enduring only a short 22 years until the dictators of Soviet imperialism by subversion and military coercion swallowed up free Lithuania, it is the anniversary of Lithuanian Independence that the Free World notices and not any anniversary of Lithuania's so-called voluntary amalgamation as a bogus "republic" of oppressed people.

The rulers of Soviet imperialism may count the 3 million souls who comprise Lithuania's present population as among the military and economic assets of Soviet Russia, but the thousands of Americans of Lithuanian stock who live in my own State and in the other States of the United States of America know that in the homeland they merely are biding their time. The fires that feed the torch of freedom burn as brightly as they ever have through Lithuania's long history.

The Kremlin propagandists talk much of their peaceful aims. They seek disarmament of the Free World.

Our country and our friends wisely have insisted that before Soviet Russia can expect any concessions from the Free World, Russia must give satisfactory guaranties of peaceful intentions.

Such guaranties have not been forthcoming; but in the swiftly changing panorama of world politics and economics, the time is near when the dictators, to save themselves, must give heed to what the conscience of the whole world demands. When this time comes, and it may be even before that, the people of Lithuania will speak, without obstruction. When they do, Lithuania again will be a free and independent state.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my colleagues here in the United States House of Representatives and pay tribute to a valiant nation which on February 16 celebrates the 40th anniversary of its independence. Lithuania, with great traditions of national sovereignty going far back in time, proclaimed its independence on February 16, 1918, ending generations of oppression by the Russian czars. Today after another World War against tyranny and in defense of freedom, Lithuania again finds herself under the iron heel of the oppressor.

It is a sobering thought to realize that for the people of Lithuania, this day cannot be other than a day of sadness. We, in America, who so rightly cherish our own Independence Day can well understand the feeling of sorrow that all Americans of Lithuanian ancestry must have at the realization that that great nation has been denied the very right to exist as an independent nation under a government of its own choosing.

The regime imposed on Lithuania by communistic Russia has violated every man's individual freedom. It has persecuted religion, enslaved labor, and destroyed every democratic principle. It has endeavored to instill hatred in the hearts of the Lithuanian people toward the Western democracies. That they have not been successful is due only to the strong inborn love the Lithuanian people have for the cherished principles of freedom and liberty.

It is a good number of years since tragedy struck Lithuania but history will assuredly show that this valiant nation cannot long remain in subjection. Tyrants can destroy men and institutions, but they can never destroy the love of liberty which springs eternally in men's hearts. The Lithuanian cause is a matter of concern for freedom-loving people throughout the world.

The future freedom of the Lithuanian people will surely come. We know it because we know something of the spirit of Lithuania and we know it will not be trampled underfoot forever. We know that Lithuania will one day be free—if only she can survive this terrible enslavement—and we know that she will survive it for we know her will to survive it. We must, however, let her know that she does not fight alone. We, in America, must pray for her and incessantly work for her eventual freedom.

Let men who cry "peace" also cry "justice"—the two are inseparable. Let the voices of honest men everywhere shout their loyalty to the cause of brave Lithuania and we can have justice. Those who pay lip service to peace, yet ignore the plight of our sister country in distress, do a disservice to that goal which they claim to seek.

Our honor must be maintained. It can be maintained by remembering Lithuania.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, February 16, marks the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Lithuania. I join my colleagues here in the House today to commemorate this occasion.

It is my sincere hope that soon again February 16 may be observed as Lithuanian Independence Day not only here in the United States and in the free world but within the confines of Lithuania. We in this country have every reason to admire the people of Lithuania for their display of extraordinary courage during their years of enslavement by the tyrants of the Kremlin. With their resolute determination to restore their nation to freedom, I am confident that it won't be long before they regain their independence and again occupy their rightful place among the freedom-loving nations of the world.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on July 4 each year American citizens celebrate their Independence Day with gay abandon. They give little thought to the struggles of their forefathers. This is understandable, because we take freedom and independence for granted. It seems as natural and free as the air we breathe.

But the celebration of independence day for a people who have no independence and no freedom is quite another matter. To peoples chafing under a foreign yoke, the memory of a historic day of deliverance is painful. If it is celebrated at all, it must be celebrated in a mood of tragic irony, like prisoners commemorating a brief interlude of freedom between two periods behind bars.

Sunday we recall the plight of the heroic Lithuanian people. We honor them for their fortitude. But instead of looking back to the past we look toward a more hopeful future—a future that we must face with courage and without wishful thinking. Everyone knows that the fate of the captive peoples in Eastern Europe is tied up with the future of the great struggle between Communist totalitarianism and Western democracy. The best tribute we can pay to Lithuania today is to rededicate ourselves to the cause of genuine democracy at home and to express our willingness to pay the high

price of American responsibility in the present international crisis.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by observing today the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence do we merely salute a ghost of the past? Is the tragic picture of a helplessly subjugated country, stripped of her liberty, her people oppressed and persecuted, an authentic one?—I think not.

The real Lithuania lives in the minds and hearts of its brave people. Today these people are a captive nation of the Soviet Union, subjugated and enslaved under the brutal yoke of communism. But despite their suffering and isolation from the rest of the world, they have kept alive their burning desire for freedom and independence. Communist oppression has failed to destroy their indomitable spirit.

The people of Lithuania are dedicated to the principles of individual liberty and national independence, and they have maintained their national identity during their long term of enslavement. A look at Lithuania's history is eloquent testimony of the character of her people and the promise of their future. Their courage was tested and proved as early as the 12th century, when they accepted martyrdom as the penalty for conversion to Christianity. In the centuries that followed, Lithuania was to suffer the steady encroachments of Teutonic knights, Polish overlords, and the Russian czars, who for more than a hundred years meted out harsh and relentless treatment.

In the 13th century Lithuania became united under one king, but enjoyed independence and self-government only at intervals between invasions by the Russians and Teutons, seeking world conquest and domination. But through centuries of conquest, occupation, insurrection, expansion, partition, and dispersion the Lithuanian people have retained their identity and patriotism.

Finally in 1918, when the Lithuanians earned their freedom, they and the friends of freedom all over the world thought the misery of foreign rule had come to an end for Lithuania. At last the chains of their involuntary servitude had been broken. A new day had dawned and a new promising life began for them as a free nation.

For more than two decades Lithuanians enjoyed their newly won independence by setting up a democratic republic and enacting social and economic measures that would revive their country. During this period Lithuanians earned and held an honorable place in the League of Nations, and, by their dedication to democratic principles and their remarkable economic and social achievements, the people of Lithuania proved their capacity for self-rule. But this glorious renaissance was doomed to a very brief life.

In 1940 the Communists after agreeing with Hitler on a division of Europe, cynically marched into Lithuania to "protect" its independence. On July 21, 1940, Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet Union—clearly a violation of international law and a crime against humanity. During the war the country was under Nazi occupation for 2 years;

then, in 1944, the dreaded Red Army returned with its political commissars and secret police. That was 14 years ago—the Red Army is still there.

The tragic story of Lithuania since 1944 has included torture, enslavement, murder, rebellion, and deportation. But in this tragedy lies a lesson to the world. Freedom must be guarded jealously and defended stoutly, otherwise it will be lost.

These valiant people of Lithuania have never forgotten the sweet taste of freedom. Despite the torture and oppression the Lithuanian people suffer today, we know that their love for liberty has never dimmed and that they have never given up the fight to regain the freedom that was once theirs. The Communist oppressors can prevent the Lithuanian people from exercising their natural right of freedom, but they cannot force these brave people to accept and believe in the tyranny imposed on them.

The people of Lithuania must know that their countrymen throughout the world, and we in the United States, have not forgotten their plight. In marking this day, we do not merely recall the dead past. But rather, we reaffirm our faith in this brave country's devotion to liberty and independence and express the hope that the day may soon come when Lithuanians may breathe the air of freedom again. These people look to us as the leader of the Free World to provide them with both moral and spiritual support which they need for the perpetuation of their noble crusade for freedom. We cannot fail them. Freedom is indivisible and is diminished everywhere when it is lost anywhere.

In Lithuania, on this the 40th anniversary of their lost independence, there are no celebrations—only silent prayer that Soviet despotism will one day disappear so freedom may reign again. Our prayers join with theirs that on a future February 16 there will be great celebrations of Lithuanian Independence Day not only in the United States, but in that little country which stubbornly refused to surrender.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with all my fellow Americans in commemorating the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian national independence, and take this occasion to extend my personal greetings to all of our fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent.

The case of Lithuania stands as a symbol of the right of every nation, large or small, to be free and independent. It also carries with it a great human story, of a heroic people who struggled over the centuries for their independence—a struggle carried on by an entire nation against the Russian despots. The Lithuanian nation, after winning its independence, demonstrated its real friendship for the United States and its unfaltering allegiance to the same free institutions which we so cherish. We Americans have always been proud of the support we gave to the Lithuanian nation in its struggle against the Russians and in building their democratic way of life which characterized Lithuania during the period between the great wars.

There is an unbreakable bond between the United States and Lithuania which has been solidly forged upon the anvil of time and experience.

All men of good will are saddened by the plight of Lithuania today, as it stands occupied by the Russian despots. Lithuania has an alien government imposed by the Kremlin which has proclaimed its bitter enmity for the United States and our free way of life, but the Lithuanian people have kept faith with us in their determined adherence to the cause of human freedom—despite the terrible penalties they must continue to pay for that position.

Lithuania, like the other non-Russian nations occupied by the Kremlin, sees in the United States the last great hope for civilization. We as a Nation stand as a bright symbol to the certainty that Lithuania will once again be free and independent.

There are strange voices in the world today calling for a recognition of the status quo, a deal with the Russians whereby Russia would keep intact its vast empire of slavery in exchange for which we would be spared the Russian hatchet for a few fleeting, humiliating years.

The modern-day Russian czar, Khrushchev, in a speech delivered from Minsk, stated that the only problem to be negotiated between the Russians and the Free World was acceptance of a status quo. He stated in unmistakable words that unless the United States and our allies are prepared to accept this first condition, negotiation of such other problems as there might be would not be considered by the Russians. In other words Khrushchev told the world that the Russians were prepared to grant a temporary peace if the Free World would recognize the present day Russian empire and undertake a nonaggression pact which would announce to the world that all the people behind the Iron Curtain were doomed to everlasting slavery.

But the voice of Khrushchev is not the only voice being heard in the world advocating this proposal. The misguided and naive George Kennan, who has been posed as a Russian expert, is the spokesman in the Free World for this plan of silent surrender. But there are other such voices, most fearing to speak out publicly, but nevertheless actively working behind the scenes for this sellout. With each passing day the devious effort to force the United States Government into recognizing the status quo takes on added intensity. This maneuver does violence to the hopes and aspirations of all the American people. The American people do not seek a few fleeting and humiliating years during which they cringe awaiting the final death blow from the Russians to our free way of life. But these voices, alien to the United States and the wishes of the American people, are gaining strength in the high councils of the Government.

There is greater need today than ever before in our history for the American people to be vigilant in the defense of our individual liberties and the advocacy of the right of every nation to be free and independent. We know that the best

guaranty for our own liberty and safety is a world in which every nation is free and all empires are dissolved.

On this 40th anniversary of Lithuanian national independence, I urge that the foreign policy of the United States be brought under critical review by the American people. In this respect the Congress of the United States can and will perform its part. The American people will, in the end, however, determine how soon we will drive these strange voices advocating a silent surrender to the Russians out into the open where they can be properly dealt with. I shall continue to do all I possibly can to hasten the day when Lithuania will be restored to its independence and its rightful position among the nations of the world.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a small but gallant nation which is today enslaved celebrates its anniversary day on Sunday, February 16. It is proper that we should note this day—the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence—because all Americans of all national origins share a common belief that Lithuania should once again be free, and a common faith that once again she will be free.

The pages of history are filled with accounts of political systems based on oppressing the inherent rights of people and crushing the spirit of other nations. Lithuania suffered this all-too-familiar fate. Nevertheless, Lithuania has continued to strive for independence and freedom. The undying dedication of her people to democratic principles and their equally undying passion for the convictions and beliefs that make those democratic principles possible have nurtured the Lithuanian desire for national survival. All of us admire this great determination to survive.

The United States has never recognized the so-called annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union. Today we reaffirm our confidence that the many years of struggling and suffering which the people of Lithuania have endured will not be in vain.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to join with the friends of Lithuania in commemorating the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuania's independence.

At great sacrifice, and after triumphing over insurmountable difficulties, Lithuania finally, in February of 1918, declared her independence and freedom from the yoke of Russian misrule. As a free nation, she proudly took her place in the world's family of free nations. She made great strides in industry, education, self-government, commerce, and in all other fields of endeavor open to her. She gained the respect of all democratic nations.

Her joy was short-lived, for in 1940 she was occupied by the Soviets and proclaimed part of the U. S. S. R. Her people have put up a fierce struggle against her oppressors; a freedom and independence-loving nation, Lithuania will continue to repulse the Communist ideology and to work toward the day when freedom will be restored to it.

The people of Lithuania have our sympathy and prayers. It is to be hoped that their prayers for freedom will be answered; that their efforts and courage will be rewarded.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join once again in a word of tribute to Lithuania and its sons and daughters on the anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania on February 16.

I have been fortunate, Mr. Speaker, in having many friends and neighbors of Lithuanian descent and in learning through them and their activities how much they and others like them in this country have contributed to America, and how much we are indebted to the land of their forebears.

We know the fine contribution which Lithuania made to the world while free.

We realize how greatly the people of Lithuania have suffered under the heel of the Communist Government of Russia.

Our hearts go out to them in their tribulations.

We join once again, Mr. Speaker, in proclaiming the hope that Lithuania may once again enjoy the freedom for which it yearns and occupy its rightful place among the nations of the Free World.

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues and with the friends of Lithuania in paying tribute to the peoples of that country today.

Any nation born of a fight for freedom would respond quickly to the Lithuanian's love of liberty which is almost synonymous with their history. Although for centuries they had been subjugated by their more powerful neighbors, the Lithuanians have refused to give up their past and allow themselves to be absorbed in the Slavonic culture. Even the intense Russification policy of 19th century Czarist rule, with the prohibitions against printing or teaching the Lithuanian language, failed in its purpose. The short period of freedom from 1918 to 1941 taught the Lithuanian people after centuries of slavery the invigorating influence of liberty and independence.

The Lithuanian people have persistently preserved their cultural heritage and their sense of racial identity from prehistoric times. The continuity of their traditions is illustrated remarkably in the Lithuanian language which, of all living European speech today, shows most closely the derivation from ancient Sanskrit, the source of all the Indo-European languages.

We must reaffirm on this occasion of the 40th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania that the Lithuanian people are not forgotten and that we, along with their countrymen in the United States, look forward to their release from the Soviet tyranny.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the indomitable spirit of a free Lithuania lives with the more than a million Americans of Lithuanian descent, and we join with our fellow citizens in praying and hoping that this gallant country will soon

break off the chains of Communist slavery that has temporarily choked off her freedom and liberty.

On February 16, 1958, Lithuanian Americans will mark the 40th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Lithuania. Moreover, February 15, 1958, marks the 705th anniversary of the establishment of the Lithuanian state in 1253 when Mindaugas the Great was crowned the first king of Lithuania.

Communism has crushed the freedom and liberty of Lithuania, but not her spirit.

Americans of Lithuanian descent have made a major contribution to the social, economic, cultural, and political growth of the free society we enjoy in the United States.

The desire for freedom still burns fiercely in Lithuania, where only a handful of Communists, aided and abetted by the godless kings of the Kremlin, have imposed their arbitrary, cruel will on the vast majority of Lithuanians.

The United States can well be proud of our fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent. With them, we pause to rejoice in the knowledge that one day Lithuania will be free again when Communist tyranny bows and dies before the inexorable forces of freedom.

We cannot and must not forget that communism has enslaved the people of Lithuania. It was not and is not their choice, and the day is coming when a free and independent Lithuania will rise again.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the world does not forget, as these tragic years go by, that the people of Lithuania proclaimed their independence on February 16, 40 years ago. It is a poignant reminder to all their peoples everywhere that liberty itself can never be taken for granted. How much more poignant then is this day to the oppressed people of Lithuania, who fought so valiantly for liberty and then lost it to the ruthless, iron grip of the Soviet Union's insatiable ambition.

The history of man proves again and again that tyranny carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction; the thirst for liberty is unquenchable. Lithuania again will be free. From this belief we must never waver. Lithuania's independence reaches back to the 11th century. We can therefore, readily understand how profoundly tragic it is for the people within Lithuania to find themselves unable to express for themselves the meaning of February 16. The Free World must then speak for them in their sorrow, in their secret dedication, and for their hope.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in extending to the people of Lithuania my warm tribute on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of Lithuania's proclamation of independence.

One hundred and twenty-three years of Russian rule came to a close when Lithuania was proclaimed an independent country on February 16, 1918, pursuant to the principle of national self-determination enumerated in President Woodrow Wilson's 14 Points. Fol-

lowing its invasion by Russian troops in 1940, the Republic of Lithuania again became subject to Russian control. The Soviet Union would have us believe that its annexation of Lithuania was in accord with the wishes of the people of this brave Republic, but it has been the consistent policy of the Government of the United States not to accord diplomatic recognition to the Russian annexation and I hope we will continue to insist upon restoration of its independence.

Lithuanian Americans can well be proud of the rich cultural heritage their forefathers shared with the world. The language and literature of this country are among the oldest in Western civilization. It is our fervent hope and prayer that these silenced people will once again—and soon—join the ranks of the free nations of the world and lift up their own voices in freedom.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will not be in session on Sunday, February 16, 1958, the day on which we would ordinarily observe the anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. In view of that fact, I would like to take the liberty of joining with the other Members of the House today in paying tribute to this brave country and her people.

Forty years ago on February 16, 1918, Lithuania proclaimed her independence. Although her existence as a free nation was short lived, and was smothered once again by Russian domination in 1940, the courage of the Lithuanians in the face of adversity and tribulation, and their loyalty to the principles of freedom and justice, are most admirable.

February 16 is a day of significance; it is a day on which we honor those who have experienced terrible hardships and persecutions at the hands of the Communists, and yet still look forward to the day when their country will once again enjoy her freedom.

We do not acknowledge the annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, but anticipate the day when the cause of liberty will triumph throughout the world.

Resistance to communism continues within the borders of Lithuania itself, at great personal sacrifice to her people, and we here in the United States must continue to encourage them in their dedication to democratic principles, and in their fight to regain their independence. Our prayers are with them, and with God's help, the day will come when Lithuania is once again free to choose her own destiny.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the Lithuanian people upon the 40th anniversary of their lost independence.

We recall with great admiration the undying spirit of these brave people who struggled for centuries to break the chains of enforced servitude. In 1918 the Lithuanians won this precious freedom and demonstrated to the world a capacity for self-government, and social and economic progress. Since 1940, however, these valiant people have been suppressed by Communist tyranny. Yet they cling steadfastly to their love of liberty and patriotism.

Today, in Lithuania, this occasion cannot be celebrated except in the minds and hearts of these brave people. Nevertheless, we as free Americans express our admiration of them and our conviction that they will soon once again enjoy the freedom and peace they so justly deserve.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker and my other distinguished colleagues, once again we are about to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day, and each year this to me is an inspiring occasion. In my Congressional District, some of the finest citizens are of Lithuanian descent, and we of Connecticut are proud that these great individuals number among us.

Now Mr. Speaker, the sturdy and stouthearted Lithuanians always ready to defend their long cherished ideals of freedom, enjoyed national independence centuries before the discovery of America. At times they formed one of the most powerful and the largest kingdoms in Europe. For hundreds of years they defended their country and its independence against all comers, but in the late 18th century they were overwhelmed and overrun by the superior and larger forces of an expanding Russia. From then on Lithuania became part of the Czarist empire, and Lithuanians its unwilling subjects who were accorded second-class citizenship.

They resented deeply the presence of foreigners on their soil, they detested their oppressive regime, and they suffered immeasurably for more than a hundred years under Russian autocracy, yet they never wavered in their devotion of the idea of national independence, nor did they entertain any doubt about the rightness of their yearning for freedom. In 1918, with the collapse of the Czarist regime, they freed themselves and proclaimed their independence on February 16 of that year.

This period of independence was to last for only two decades. Then they were caught in the grip of World War II, and their independence became one of the first casualties of that war. Since those days, for more than 17 years, Lithuanians have been suffering under the brutal agents of the Communist regime. Long ago they were forced to exchange their freedom for totalitarian tyranny, and they are groaning under it today. There they have no opportunity or freedom to observe their most sacred national holiday, their Independence Day. Here in this land of liberty we observe that anniversary, the 40th anniversary of that memorable event, and rightly echo their sentiments, and we hope that soon they also have the privilege of celebrating their Independence Day in a free Lithuania.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1958, Americans of Lithuanian ancestry will be remembering a once joyous occasion of 40 years ago when a group of patriots proclaimed the declaration of independence of Lithuania. This once-known freedom did not come easy. Only through struggle, hardship, and bloodshed did Lithuania regain its right to live as a free nation. Truly this was a repetition of the history made

by our own Colonies which culminated with the Declaration of Independence of the United States.

For more than two decades Lithuania grew in stature. Major progress was made in agriculture and industry. In March 1939 this hard-fought freedom came to an end. Today Lithuania is an enslaved nation ruled by a puppet government. Her people are scattered throughout slave-labor camps of Europe and the wastes of Siberia.

The United States has not recognized the absorption of Lithuania, and the Voice of America broadcasts inform the people of Lithuania of the fact that their brothers and sisters in the United States are continuing their fight through the many American Lithuanian organizations.

On this the 40th anniversary of the Lithuanian declaration of independence the freedom-loving Americans of Lithuanian descent and American friends of Lithuania renew our pledge to the peoples of Lithuania. We assure them of our hope for the restoration of freedom to Lithuania and the day that all Lithuanian nationals will be returned to their native land.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the day when Lithuanians celebrate their independence day—the day in 1918 when at the end of World War I freedom was again restored to that troubled land.

But, alas, it was to be short lived. For after only a comparatively few years of liberty, the Russian colossus, in 1940, swept down upon the little country and, contrary to her solemn pledge, eliminated all vestiges of freedom and by decree absorbed Lithuania into the Soviet empire.

But no decree can wipe out the love of liberty in the hearts of the Lithuanian people. Those who live in that land and those here and abroad who take pride in their Lithuanian descent pray for that day when tyranny will be wiped out and the flag of freedom will again wave high.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the people of Lithuania proclaimed their independence as a nation.

Today, 40 years later, the people of Lithuania once again are living under the rule of foreign tyrants—the same Russian tyrants who for so long have held this small but proud nation in bondage.

It is a tragic fact that only outside Lithuania—in the countries of the Free World to whom Lithuanians have brought their great cultural heritage—can the memory of Lithuanian freedom be celebrated. Only in the Free World can Lithuanians speak for their brethren in the silenced homeland of their unceasing struggle for freedom.

It is to the eternal credit of our American neighbors of Lithuanian descent that they have been true to their heritage, that they have faithfully rededicated themselves each year on this anniversary occasion to the great cause of freedom.

In doing so, they serve not only the cause of independence for their own homeland, but the greater cause of freedom and justice for all mankind.

As Americans, they join with others of our neighbors whose roots go back across

the sea—to Poland and Scotland, Italy and Ireland, Czechoslovakia and Greece, Israel and England—to native lands whose histories recount the never-ending fight of the free man to secure this birthright for all his fellows. Together, we have made America the bastion of the Free World.

Let us, then, on this occasion, join with our Lithuanian friends everywhere in reasserting our firm opposition to Soviet aggression, in pledging never to forget our obligations to the people of Lithuania and other captive nations, and in making our own freedom here at home real and true and effective for all our people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues in the Congress to take renewed inspiration from the devotion to these goals of our American citizens of Lithuanian descent.

As evidence of this resolution, I ask that the following resolutions, unanimously adopted by the Linden (N. J.) branch of the Lithuanian-American Council, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED ON FEBRUARY 2, 1958, BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF LINDEN, N. J., GATHERED UNDER AUSPICES OF LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, LINDEN BRANCH, FOR COMMEMORATION OF THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Whereas Lithuania was formally declared a free and independent Republic by the Council of Lithuania in Vilnius on February 16, 1918; and

Whereas Americans of Lithuanian descent commemorate this year the 40th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania as a free and independent state, and hope it may again regain the liberties and rights of a sovereign nation; and

Whereas the worldwide problems confronting the United States have grown in number and magnitude to an extent unequaled in our Nation's history; and

Whereas no nation, large or small, is today secure from the perils of international communism supported by the destructive weapons of modern science; Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian descent, shall continue to support the efforts of the Lithuanian people to regain their liberation; and

Resolved, That the Government of the United States enter into no agreements which would in any way acknowledge the fruits of any past, present, or future Soviet aggression; and

Resolved, That we record our appreciation of the United States policy of nonrecognition of the forcible incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union; and

Resolved, That it is our hope this policy will be firmly maintained by representatives of our Government at any forthcoming deliberations concerning the status of subjugated nations; and

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles; to the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations, the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.; to the United States Senators of New Jersey, the Honorable H. Alexander Smith and the Honorable Clifford P. Case; and to the Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, the Honorable Florence P. Dwyer.

JOHN LIUDVINAITIS,
President.
VLADAS TURSA,
Secretary.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, wars are always destructive. They cause irreparable physical damage and leave scars in human relationships that are seldom erased. Sometimes they set back the clock of advancement and progress in human affairs by decades and centuries. And sometimes it takes generations for certain countries to recover from severe war losses.

In spite of the fact that war is hell, people sometimes willingly enter war for the attainment of certain high goals, such as liberty, justice, independence, and other inalienable human rights. National independence is one of these rights. To some people political freedom is the most noble of ideals.

The First World War caused indescribable horrors and unheard-of misery in all parts of Europe, but it also ushered in a new era, to many submerged and suppressed nationalities. Herein many people found some justification for that war. Many of these peoples emerged, even before the end of that war, as independent and sovereign states. In due time they became respected and respectable members of the family of nations. Lithuanians formed one of these old but newly formed, re-emerged, rehabilitated and reborn nations.

These brave and courageous people had their national independence and enjoyed full freedom in their historic homeland on the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea long before the birth of the Russian state, but late in the 18th century Russia conquered Lithuania and annexed it. For more than one hundred years Lithuanians endured Russia's autocratic regime. Several times they tried to shake it off, but it was not possible for a people of a few millions to shake off the rule of a gigantic colossus. In 1917, however, the Russian autocracy was overthrown in the revolution. Then Lithuanians felt free and proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918.

It is that day, the 40th anniversary of that historic event, which is being celebrated today by all Lithuanians and their friends in all free countries. It is of course most appropriate that it should be celebrated by Lithuanians in Lithuania, but by a tragic irony of fate that supreme privilege is denied to them by their stern and unbending Communist masters. Their friends and descendants in the Free World today solemnly commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day, by adding their prayers to the supplications of the suffering Lithuanian people that their day of delivery from under the heel of their cruel oppressors may be speeded so that they may emerge from behind the infamous Iron Curtain of Soviet tyranny, that is holding a courageous, God-fearing, and peace-loving nation in abject slavery.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, once again we take occasion to commemorate with our Lithuanian-American friends a day of dedication in the place of what would be, under more auspicious circumstances, a day of festivities: Lithuanian Independence Day, February 16.

To these friends of ours this day will be a day of dedication to the past, to the memory of the brave people of Lithuania

who have remained unsubdued in spirit even though imprisoned by Soviet tyranny.

But even more, it should be a day of dedication to the future. This we in the Free World can express in a number of ways. In the first place, we can continue to share with the Lithuanian and other peoples of the captive European nations, insofar as we are able, our faith and hope in their eventual freedom. Modern weapons have, it is true, added a new dimension to the ancient struggle against tyranny. These weapons in the possession of despots provide a powerful deterrent to the forces of freedom. But over the long course of years the sword has never been mightier than the spirit. In captive Europe the human heart, the human will, the human mind will yet prevail over the might of the overlords.

In the second place, we can promote the concept of a free Lithuania as part of a free Europe. European integration has been making rapid strides in the past few years. Our plans, our faith in the eventual dissolution of Soviet imperialism should take into account that the Europe of the future should not be patterned too closely on prewar Europe, many of whose small and disunited states became easy preys to aggression. Indeed, the assembly of captive European nations, in which Lithuania is represented, has gone on record as favoring the integration of Eastern Europe into a United Europe.

And, finally, we can strive to promote by every means, in our own country, in Europe, those human rights without which no man is truly free. The objective of a free Lithuania as part of a free Europe must include as its most vital element the concept of a Europe where the individual is free. A powerful and united Europe imbued with doctrines alien to the freedom of the individual, such as communism or fascism, would be a curse and not a blessing.

May the friends of the subjugated Lithuanian people find ways of keeping alive their faith in eventual liberation; of contributing toward the integration of Europe, which could lead to peace; and of helping to maintain and promote those individual freedoms upon which the Atlantic community could build for the security and welfare of mankind.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the First World War sounded the death knell of a number of autocratic empires. That war also ushered in a new era of independence and freedom for a large number of suppressed and submerged nationalities in Europe. In that sense World War I, destructive and devastating though it was, produced something on the credit side in the form of the newly formed numerous independent democratic states. One of these states was Lithuania.

The history of modern Lithuania goes back to mid-13th century. The Lithuanian state came into being as an independent entity in the year 1253, more than 700 years ago. Since those days Lithuania's long and turbulent history has followed a rather uneven course; it has had its ups and downs. That history is marked by greatness and glory during the first few centuries, while

misfortune and misery claim a large role in the lives of the Lithuanians during most of the last 200 years.

During the 14th and 15th centuries Lithuania became one of the most powerful and great states in all eastern and northern Europe. In the 16th century it was united with Poland, under a Lithuanian king, and from then on the fate of the two countries was bound together. Late in the 18th century, when Poland lost her independence and most of that country was incorporated in Czarist Russia, Lithuania shared the same fate. Then for almost a century and a half the stalwart and stout-hearted Lithuanians suffered under the unrelenting Russian regime, though not for a moment did they lose sight of the prime objective they had as their common goal—the attainment of their national political independence.

At the end of the First World War, when Russia's Czarist regime was overthrown, and the new Communist regime had not yet shown its ugly nature, the Lithuanians proclaimed their independence. They set up a republic, and a truly democratic form of government was instituted which ruled the new state for two decades. For a score of years Lithuanians made significant progress in the task of rebuilding their country. In reshaping their destiny the Lithuanians were helped by their friends everywhere, especially by Americans of Lithuanian descent. Then came the Second World War and Lithuania's woes began to multiply. This small country was one of the earliest victims of that war. In 1940 the country was swallowed up by the Soviet Union. In mid-1941 Nazi forces came, expelled the heartless Communists, and stayed there almost to the end of the war. Then the Communists returned once more with insensate fury and insolence, and there they remain today. No wonder the Lithuanians cannot celebrate this day, the 40th anniversary of their Independence Day, in their homeland. Freedom and democracy have been stamped out there by their ruthless oppressors. We in this country by availing ourselves of the opportunity presented by the observance of this memorable day, hope to encourage the idea of freedom which still burns brightly in the minds and hearts of all Lithuanians.

Mr. DELLAY. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago the people of Lithuania declared their independence. For the next 22 years, the young republic surged with joyous effort, and the liberated people accomplished more during that time than at any other generation in their history.

Then the darkness came, first from one side and then from the other, until Lithuania was forcibly taken over by the Soviet Union. Since then, more than 50 percent of the Catholic clergy has been annihilated by the ruthless conquerors.

There are holes in the Iron Curtain—tiny though they may be. Even though Russia has launched a satellite, it cannot stifle the religious zeal and sturdy independence of the Lithuanian people. They have outlived other tyrannies and their spirit will finally prevail over those who now oppress them.

The news that leaks through to us tells us of brave resistance. The one thing that the Communists fear above all else is the truth. They realize that if people get to know each other as fellow human beings, the fabric of lies upon which communism is built will topple like a house built on sand.

The intercontinental ballistic missile, carrying a hydrogen bomb, could kill millions of people, but it is the truth that will finally win. And the truth put to work now could immobilize this hideous weapon of destruction and all others like it.

Eventually, the free peoples of the world will get their message through the Iron Curtain, even to the people of Russia, and then they too will rise up against those who keep them in bondage.

The light is dim in Lithuania—but it is still glowing. It glows in every Lithuanian heart where the Communists cannot reach it. It glows in their resistance. It glows as they think of the day when freedom will again be theirs.

I extend congratulations to the Lithuanian people on this anniversary of their Independence Day. Let us also join them in more than words in their efforts to unloose the shackles of tyrants and reestablish their independence.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, freedom in the world today is a very dear and precious thing. The people of Lithuania know just how dear it can be, for they are living in a world of terror, actually faced with the prospect of annihilation as a people.

It is with great pride that they may look upon February 16, 1958, the 40th anniversary of their declaration of independence. Of course, no Lithuanian under the Communist Government is allowed to celebrate his National Independence Day. Although we of the Free World do not share his lot, we do share his hopes and dreams. It is with great sympathy that we of the United States of America extend our greetings to a beleaguered people.

In recognition of their stanch patriotism, the friends of Lithuania join with those of Lithuanian descent in hoping that this day of national celebration may again be a joyful holiday for a free Lithuania.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and proud today to join my colleagues in the House in celebrating the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence.

Even the Iron Curtain has been unable to dim the fervor of the Lithuanian people for independence and freedom.

I am convinced that the Lithuanian nation will continue to fight for liberty until it is won; for there is no appeasement in Lithuania, and its noble people will never bow under the yoke of Soviet oppression and persecution.

Nor will their compatriots and countrymen in America abate their interest or cease their efforts until sovereignty and independence is secured for this unhappy land which has been stripped of its political rights and dragged into the orbit of Communist slavery.

Lithuania has a proud and inspiring heritage, and the people of Lithuanian descent in this country are among our

best citizens. I have many Lithuanian people in my district, and I am proud of their contributions. They are God fearing and liberty loving. They are honest, industrious, loyal citizens devoted to our free way of life. They have demonstrated by their actions and by exemplary loyalty that they are willing to make every sacrifice to sustain American institutions.

Such a nation and such a people is entitled, not only to our sympathy and our moral support, but to our active, effective assistance in forwarding their high aims for the recapture of their liberties and the reestablishment of their sovereignty.

Our own great Nation must make it abundantly clear to all other nations that we stand for liberation from tyranny and oppression and for self-determination and freedom of choice for all peoples to ordain and to establish their own form of government under democratic processes.

All hail to Lithuania on the anniversary of its 40th birthday. May her courageous people soon regain their precious liberties.

THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO, HERO OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION (1746-1817)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Thaddeus Kosciuszko was one of those rare and brave soldiers of fortune, so abundant in Poland, who was willing to go anywhere and serve under any banner for the cause of liberty and freedom. This gifted and gallant son of an impoverished Polish gentry was destined to be a soldier of distinction. He received his military education on scholarships, first in Poland and then in France. At the time he found few opportunities for his talents in Poland. In 1776 he was in Paris, where his imagination was deeply stirred by the news of the American Revolution. Right there and then he decided to come to America. He did this on borrowed money and arrived in Philadelphia in August of 1776.

On his arrival he immediately applied for military service. First he was employed to draw up plans for the fortifications of the Delaware River. In 3 months the successful completion of these plans earned him a commission as colonel of engineers in the Continental Army. In the spring of 1777 he joined the northern army at Ticonderoga, and there he advised on the fortifications of Mount Defiance. During the next 2 years he was placed in charge of the erection of fortifications at West Point. Subsequently, he saw service at Charleston, S. C., and was one of the first Continentals to enter that city after its evacuation by the British.

In recognition of his signal services for the cause of the Revolution, Con-

gress made him a brigadier general on October 13, 1783. A year later he returned to Poland, hoping to serve there in her struggle for freedom. In 1789 he was made major general in the Polish Army, and for many years he continued to lead the unfortunate Poles in their hopeless struggle. He was disappointed in his gallant attempts, and he died in exile in 1817 in Switzerland.

On February 12 we honor his memory on the 212th anniversary of his birth, the birth of this noble soul of Poland who served courageously and bravely in the service of our Fight for Independence.

THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on February 15 the Nation will observe the 60th anniversary of the diabolical sinking of the battleship *Maine* in Habana Harbor, the frightful tragedy that led to our war with Spain and a chain of world-reshaping events that brought the United States to her present position of world responsibility. As the House will not be in session on February 15, nor on February 14, I am taking advantage of this opportunity, unanimously accorded me in the graciousness of my colleagues, to pay my tribute, and I trust that of the entire membership of this body, to the memory of the brave men who perished with the *Maine*. Their names are unknown to most of this generation, but to them all mankind forever will be indebted. By their untimely deaths, and the response of the American people to the circumstances of their taking, our United States was started on the road of her destiny.

When I read the history of our country, written by men and women who were not born when 60 years ago the 15th of February the battleship *Maine* was sunk, I wonder how people can grow up and be so unmindful and unheeding of what transpired and what stirred the spirit of people who lived and breathed and died in the remote period before they were born. Reading of these events that transpired in my own life, and in which in a very small way I was a participant, I get to wondering how much truth there is in any written history. I wonder if, in the history of centuries ago, we read that someone was a great servitor that he might not have been the greatest villain of his time, but he had a good press. I wonder if someone that history tells us was a great villain might not have been the greatest servitor of the people of his time, but he had a bad press. So much in the public addresses of the present is written by ghostwriters, how can those who follow make proper appraisal of the virtues and the faults, the intelligent grasp, or the stupidity of those whose part is merely the reading of the lines and the pose that he who reads must necessarily be he who thinks out and writes the lines? Researchers in the future can pursue with fidelity and integrity the record of past

times, but always that which has escaped the ravishes of time is that implanted in the record by those who had the sagacity or the means to employ or to inspire that which we call a good press.

Some years ago the woman who is now my administrative assistant came to me. I was then talking over the air. It was at the time President Roosevelt's court reform was under wide public discussion. She said, "Mr. O'HARA, who are the men who wrote the Constitution?" And I started rattling off the names that we all know, and then I stopped. And she said, "Go on." And I said, "I get your point, I know but a few, the others are unknown to me." There were 55 delegates to the Constitutional Convention, 39 who signed that priceless document. Few persons know the names of more than a dozen. I did not, and I wished to know more about them, these men who wrote the Constitution of our country. She started the task of research and reported back that at that time there was not a single book that contained a biographical sketch of all the men who had made our Constitution. And then this woman a scholar and a skilled researcher, started going into the forgotten tones of history to find something about some of these men that history had passed over entirely. With some there was nothing to be found. On the sands of time they had left no footprints, and were it not for Major Pierce, a delegate who wrote pen sketches of his colleagues, the present generation would know nothing at all of some of that immortal band of 55 that gave to the world in the Constitution of the United States the framework of democratic government.

Now why am I speaking about this? Because only a handful of Spanish War veterans will note that February 15 is the 60th anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*. Only a handful of Spanish War veterans, with members of their families, and with a scattering of representatives from patriotic and veterans' organizations, will meet in memorial exercises to note the sacrifice of those lives in Habana Harbor 60 years ago. Yet when the news of the sinking of the *Maine* reached the ears of the American people in February of 1898 the emotions and the indignation of the American people were stirred as never before in our history. There followed a war fought by sea and on land in the Atlantic and the Pacific; fought by an Army and a Navy composed entirely of volunteers; fought against terrific odds and under every conceivable hardship, and brilliantly won in the shortest period of time of any war of nations in all recorded history.

Maj. Gen. William R. Shafter, commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Force in Cuba, said in a speech in Los Angeles:

There is no use thinking that men can go into that climate at that season of the year and escape diseases than there is that you can put your hand in the fire and escape burning it. That army, I believe, was the best that ever stood up in America. I won't except even the gallant fellows of the northern and southern armies.

Shafter was a Civil War veteran.

The armies of the North and South excelled my men in only one thing—they knew what fatigue meant. In every other respect, the army in Cuba has never been excelled by any army we ever had in this country.

Brig. Gen. S. D. Rockenbach, who served as a second lieutenant with the 10th United States Cavalry in Cuba in 1898 and later as a line officer in France in World War I, said:

My observation of the Santiago and Puerto Rico campaigns, in the light of the World War, is that the energy per man exerted and the hardships endured were many times that of 1918 and on half the food. The success was miraculous.

Every year since I have been in the Congress, on the day closest to the 15th of February I have been in this well speaking on the Spanish-American War and remembering the heroes who went down in the *Maine* 60 years ago. Every year that I shall remain in this Congress I shall be here, and my hope is that after I am gone some younger man will take up so that never shall the 15th of February pass that the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine* is not here being given mention.

I hope that in the years to come when the researchers are digging and digging that they may get an appraisal for the record of history of the things that have happened in the growth of our Republic they will come across some of the things, reflective of the spirit of 1898, that I in my humble and ineloquent way have said on these occasions.

The United States of America has a destiny in the service of mankind. The sinking of the *Maine* and the resultant war with Spain started her on the road to that destiny. Every individual and every nation has a mission. Make no mistake on that. We are not put here as individuals or as groups of individuals banded into States, just haphazardly. For every individual and every State there is a mission. I do not care whether you approach an understanding of this through a religious faith or whether you approach understanding by the realization that the laws of nature that control everything are much more powerful than the laws of man and thus that which is responsible for them is of a higher intelligence than our own. So these United States of ours have had a mission and a destiny. In the earlier years of our national history people always talked about the destiny of our country. They believed in it.

Let me digress here for a moment. I found that same thing, that blind faith in a destiny, recently when I went to Africa and the Near East. I found everywhere many people who may not have had much schooling, if any, but they felt the beckoning of destiny, they felt they were serving a purpose, that there was a future in the making of which they were to have a part. I found it all over Africa. I found it all over the Near East. I would see it in the faces of people and read it in their conduct. I thought back to the earlier days of our country when we did not have much in strength or in material things, but there was faith and in every Ameri-

can mind was the beckoning of a vision and the sounding call of destiny.

In 1898 something happened in Habana Harbor. The *Maine* was blown up. Nobody has ever fixed the cause, and I do not want to convict anybody on suspicion or upon hearsay. Until the cause for the sinking of the *Maine* is definitely fixed, and I do not suppose it ever will be, I am not going to accuse anyone of that dastardly act. But it happened, and the *Maine*, in a peaceful harbor, was blown up and many brave Americans were killed.

All over the country went up the cry, "Remember the *Maine*."

Of course, the American people responded. The call went out for volunteers. We had then an Army of only 25,000 men. Everybody in our country thought, with the close of the War Between the States, we had for all time left the field of Mars. So we were not prepared for war—but it came. The conditions were such that today it is hard for anyone in this generation to believe that such things could have come to pass. There were no records. There were no medicines. There was no organization. In Cuba, in the Tropics and in the dead of summer, we were clothed with winter clothing. We were living on sow-belly—grease—and the meat that was sent down there was all putrid. The campaign in Cuba was fought and gloriously won. The accomplishment of our soldiers justified the highest of plaudits. Then, when the fighting was over, and the victory won over superior numbers and in record time, the condition of our soldiers due to the lack of care and to the lack of medicine and the lack of food was such that if the Army had remained 1 month longer in Cuba, there perhaps would not have been a single person left. They were dying like flies. On the transport on which I left Santiago for Montauk Point, I was the only soldier able to keep on my feet, and that was only because of an earlier experience in my boyhood in the Tropics. Many of the soldiers on that transport died at sea and were buried at sea. Then, when those who survived returned home, many more died from diseases that they had contracted in Cuba.

I know that when future historians, if we leave enough of a record so that researchers can dig it up, write the history of the rise to world responsibility of the United States, they will call it all a 50-year war. It started in 1898. Then there was a period of peace. Then World War I, with practically the same alignment; it was the same war. Then another period of peace. Then World War II. Future historians will call it a 50-year war that carried the United States to her position of world responsibility.

The historian will see in this 50-year war, starting with the sinking of the *Maine* in Habana Harbor on February 15, 1898, the ushering in of the ascendancy of the United States of America as a dominating world power. Then will come the golden centuries of American influence in carrying all mankind to ever higher plateaus of contentment, dignity, and brotherhood. But it is our mission,

while we are here, to give our contribution to making this period of American responsibility in the world one that will forever be remembered in history as the golden years, when in no home in any land was left the bite and sting of poverty. There is no place in a world, rich with all the gifts of God, where 1 child should go to bed at night hungry; where 1 woman or 1 man should want for that which a bountiful God has made available.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for the statement he is making commemorating years of American history, and especially pertaining to the Spanish-American War. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is the only Spanish-American War veteran serving in the Congress of the United States. Each year I have heard the gentleman take the floor and remind the people of our country, and Congress, of some of the factual history of that great conflict.

I was particularly interested in his statement that one of the failures of our historical writers is the fact that so much of our history is not preserved and recorded—for posterity.

As a member of the special Congressional committee that was appointed by the Speaker of the House a year ago last September to represent the Congress at the unveiling of a monument to Commodore John Barry, the father of the American Navy, I made an effort to go into the historical archives at the Library of Congress. I wanted to get some facts regarding some of our Revolutionary heroes. It was astounding to find that on some of our outstanding Revolutionary heroes there was very little to be found.

Commodore John Barry was the father of the American Navy, but for some reason or other facts concerning his great accomplishments and the work he did were not in existence. A few remnants of some of his great work were recorded, but there was very little.

I also was very much impressed with the remarks the gentleman from Illinois made as to the conditions the soldiers had to endure and suffer in the Spanish-American War, conditions which as he afterward stated, were brought about by lack of preparation and preparedness on the part of our Government in those days. But we did not learn any lesson from the experience the gentleman from Illinois and his comrades endured during the days of the Spanish-American War. Within less than 20 years, we were in World War I, and tens of thousands of American boys were drafted to fight with no military preparation whatsoever. Friends of mine, and comrades, were taken in 1917 and within 6 weeks they were fighting in the trenches, some of them in overalls, not even equipped with uniforms. This great Nation of ours lost sight of the fact that preparation and attention should be given to emergencies which are liable to arise at any time.

Nor did our nation learn a lesson from World War I, because not so many years

afterward we were in World War II. We were in the same situation, as far as preparedness was concerned, that we found ourselves in when World War I broke out.

Remember Pearl Harbor? I do not need to reiterate to the Members of Congress how poorly prepared we were at the time of Pearl Harbor.

So I think it is fitting and proper that on more occasions Members of Congress should take the interest the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] has always taken, to remind the American people and the Members of Congress that we should be more alert in the matter of national defense in the future than we have been in the past.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his fine contribution.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I want to compliment the gentleman from Illinois for the splendid statement he has made. I think it is very significant that we remember the suffering those soldiers endured. One of our colleagues a moment ago spoke about the soldiers being unprepared in World War I. I sometimes think we are shortsighted, and I am happy that the gentleman from Illinois is bringing this question at this time to the attention of the Congress. We are facing a situation that might be bad. We are losing sight of the fact that all the wars that have ever been fought have been fought by men on the battlefield.

Today, at this particular hour, we have not learned very much. After World War II, we tore down the forts. We discharged the soldiers. We quit making guns. Then we called the soldiers into the conflict in Korea without guns and ammunition with which to fight and protect themselves and our great country.

Today, at this hour, we are about to cut the Army below the danger point. Some of the best authorities in America, those who have fought the wars, those who are in on the know-how, the Secretary of the Army and others, say that if we cut below 929,000 men we will be below the danger point. We are discharging soldiers that may be needed in a few days or a few weeks. Unless the Congress wakes up to the fact and stops the proposed cut, if war should come, we will be found wanting again. We are cutting the Army this year to 900,000; next year to 870,000—may I repeat, this is far below what many of our officers in the Army think is the danger point.

Let us not repeat this mistake again.

I am not opposed to the missile program. I have and will continue to vote for that program. But the missile program is in its experimental stage. The Army is the old tried and proven. I vote for defense, but I do not wish to be foolish enough to stand idly by and see the Army cut below what many of us think is, and I repeat, below the danger point. Be sure if trouble does come, we will have to have sufficient troops with which to defend this great country of

ours, and we cannot defend it on an experimental basis.

I have introduced legislation this day for the Army strength to remain at not less than 929,000 troops. I have written a letter to every Representative and Senator and have received more than 200 replies, all agreeing we should not cut the Army at this time.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman from Illinois wishes to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs he won the love of every Spanish War veteran and of every Spanish War veteran's widow. He was a real friend of the Spanish veterans and their widows. I hope that as this body has acted on the bill to increase the pension of our Spanish War widows, so will the other body act.

At times during the night I find it difficult to sleep. During the day I have received letters from these old women. They have not any social security, nothing was left them by their husbands, these men who when they were boys were my comrades. They are struggling along on something like \$52 a month. They are old women, all of them past 70. I would say most of them are past 80. They have not money with which to buy medicine. In this House unanimously three times did the membership vote to increase the pension of these widows to \$75 a month, but the bill has never been acted on in the other body. Oh, yes, the Bureau of the Budget sent a letter in which it said that there is no need of our doing anything for these widows now because their condition is static. Imagine, saying the condition of a person 80 years of age is static; in other words, having lived to be 80 years old she is going to live on forever and can do it on \$52 a month. What the Bureau of the Budget most needs is an exchange of ice water for red blood. How static is ice?

The Bureau of the Budget unleashed its classic on women of 80 being static at a time when the administration was saying we ought to up the pensions for retired generals and their widows. It wondered how a woman with position could get along with less than \$12,000. But the Bureau of the Budget said, "Oh, we cannot afford to give these Spanish War widows any more money; it would bankrupt our country." My colleagues, if we follow that philosophy, that the widow in high social position cannot be asked to live beneath her rank but another widow, whose husband has served faithfully and well but in the ranks, can starve, we do not deserve our place in history. We are not going to follow that philosophy.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to one whom every veteran in America loves, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I want to thank the gentleman for his very wonderful speech in appreciation of the Spanish-American War veterans and the veterans of all the wars. The Spanish-American War veterans are very fortunate to have the gentleman from

Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] in the House to fight their battles. It should not be necessary. And, I am just as sure and certain as I am alive that if the other body for once would pass the Spanish-American War widows bill, the President would sign it. He signed the so-called pension bill, as the gentleman will remember, some years ago. He has never vetoed but one bill, and that was a loan bill. So, I have faith in saying to you, using a slang expression, President Eisenhower's bite is worse than his bark. I do not believe that he analyzes his statements. I would like to say to the gentleman that the Spanish-American War veterans made very great contributions toward medicine. The veterans of World War I had very much better medical and surgical care; very much better food. The veterans of World War II had very much better medical care and very much better food. During the Korean war it is true that supplies did not reach the veterans, but those that did were better than those of the other wars. I do not think the gentleman spoke of the fact that every veteran, every soldier who fought in the Spanish-American War, was a volunteer. The Spanish-American War united the United States, as the gentleman knows, as I believe no other single thing could have done. The contribution was tremendous. The example of our people fighting on foreign shores for another nation, with nothing to be gained for ourselves, was not lost on the world, although sometimes it seems as though it were. All honor and praise to you, sir, and to your great Spanish-American War veterans. May you be very successful this year. You deserve success for your Spanish-American War veterans and for your great contribution.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. No one is closer to the hearts of veterans, the veterans of all wars. No one has worked harder or longer or with fuller heart for the veterans, their widows, their dependents, their cause. When the other body passes the Spanish War widows bill, and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts takes it to the President I am sure he will not find it in his heart to deny her plea. It is most heartening to hear from Mrs. ROGERS the good news that the President will sign the bill once the other body has passed it.

I am going to close with a reference to something said by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. She referred to the part that the Spanish-American War played in reuniting our country. I grew up in the North in the period following the War Between the States, and when I was growing up there were boys growing up in the South and the war had not been too far away, and there were wounds on both sides. In the Spanish-American War I was in a Michigan regiment. Most of the boys came from the high schools of Michigan. I was a sophomore in high school. We were in a camp near Washington for a month before we sailed for Cuba. It was called Camp Alger. One day the report came to us that a regiment was coming in from Tennessee. We lined up to greet the boys from

Tennessee. The boys from Michigan threw their hats in the air and shouted; here at long last we were brothers in arms again, the boys from Michigan in the same army with the boys from Tennessee. Those who are not familiar with that period may not understand. The Spanish-American War did more to heal the wounds of the Civil War than anything else that happened or could have happened.

WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT THE RECESSION-DEPRESSION — HON. HOWARD SMITH ANSWERED ON FEDERAL RESERVE QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal said about what should be done to prevent the recession getting worse. There are several things that can be done.

The monetary authorities have been fighting inflation for the last 2 years or longer. I think they fought inflation too long. They were fighting inflation after we were suffering from a deflationary condition. In fact, for many months we have been in a bad recession and some parts of our economy have been suffering from a depression. I refer particularly to the farmers, the small-business people, the home builders; and now even those engaged in the production and sale of automobiles are likewise in a depression. And so are the railroads. It is getting worse day by day. Even if the administration were to make an aggressive start right now, using the many tools at their disposal, in cooperation with the Federal Reserve System, I doubt that we would be on our way back to recovery before September or October. It takes a long time for money to travel. It takes a long time for credit to go into the channels of trade and commerce in a way to help the entire economy.

The Federal Reserve Board I think made a serious mistake when they were fighting inflation by raising interest rates. The policy of raising interest rates, of course, met with the approval of the administration in power. To raise interest rates to fight inflation to me is very much like pouring gasoline on a fire to fight the fire. It just adds to the fire. Whenever you increase interest rates you increase the cost of production, you increase the cost of everything that people, the consumers, buy, you increase taxes. There is not another action that could possibly be taken that would so automatically and arbitrarily and immediately increase the budget of every person in America and every government in America. It is one action that increases the cost of the Federal Gov-

ernment, the State, the political subdivisions of States and cities. It raises taxes everywhere. It increases prices everywhere.

SIXTY DOLLARS PER CAPITA INTEREST RATE INCREASE

We are paying now approximately \$10 billion more in interest charges per year than we paid 5 years ago for approximately the same amount of debt, both public and private, because of increased interest rates. That means that every man, woman, and child is paying approximately \$60 a year increase just on interest rates. That does not mean that only those who buy something on the installment plan or purchase something on credit pay their part of this \$60. It is in their tax bill, it is in their food bill, it is in everything that they buy, this \$10 billion excess that we are paying today because of the increased price of interest.

FOR PROFITABLE BANKING SYSTEM

As the Federal Reserve Board would increase the rediscount rate one-quarter of 1 percent commencing April 15, 1955, when the last hard-money high-interest policy really started, that meant an arbitrary increase of interest rates clear across the board to every person, firm, or corporation. That meant that the bankers would make more money. I am not opposed to the bankers making money. I am in favor of the banks making money. I believe in a profitable banking system because our commercial banking system, one of the finest in the world, should certainly be protected and we should allow them to make a good profit. That is all right. I do not object to it. I believe in the Federal Reserve System if it is operated in the public interest and if it is operated by people charged with performing a public service. But I do not think the present Federal Reserve System is operating in a manner that is calculated to serve the public in the best way. I understand why. My belief is that it is almost impossible for the Board members who are charged with performing a public service to perform that service freely and voluntarily in the manner and way I am sure they would like to. We have seven members on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Those 7 members are surrounded by 24 representatives of the private banks, who are helping them perform their service in the public interest. In a case like that you know that the pressure is bound to be terrific on those charged with the duty of protecting the public interest to see the viewpoint of those who naturally see the selfish-interest viewpoint having an ax to grind. It is understandable how it is so difficult for our public members to perform their public service. In fact, I sympathize with them. I am bringing no charge of corruption against them. Certainly, they are doing the best they can under the circumstances and under the handicaps and limitations under which they must perform their duties. But Congress should get them away from that embarrassing situation and should take the bankers off of these boards determining monetary policy. We should

not permit bankers to be on a Government board where decisions are made that affect our interest rates and that cause interest rates to be high or low; that cause the money supply to be plentiful or scarce. That is where Congress comes in. Congress should do something about it.

WHAT FED CAN DO ABOUT THE RECESSION-DEPRESSION

There are three ways that the Federal Reserve can do something to aid us in this depressed condition. One way is that the Open Market Committee could go into the open market and buy Government bonds and pay Federal Reserve notes for those bonds just as they normally do and just as they do all during the year. That puts money out into circulation. It provides reserves for the banks, the commercial banks, upon which they can expand \$6 to every \$1. That helps business generally. It helps the country. That is No. 1. I think they should first use the open-market operations.

REDUCE DISCOUNT RATE

No. 2, I think they should at the same time reduce the discount rates of the Federal Reserve banks. Now they have been reduced to 2¾ percent from 3½ percent. But, in view of the depressed situation, they should reduce that and cut it to at least 2 percent and maybe less than that.

AS LAST RESORT REDUCE RESERVE REQUIREMENTS

As a last resort, of course, they could change the reserve requirements of banks. That is weapon No. 3. But there is the weapon that would be used if you want to make sure to guarantee that the banks profit above everybody else. The banks do not need these extra profits. They are making good money. I think the Federal Reserve Board and the Open Market Committee should look at this problem from the standpoint of the public interest, and the public interest only. They should not be taking action such as they have taken in fighting inflation to take the only course that meant more profit and greater profit to the commercial banking system. I think they should stop that and look to the public interest and use weapon No. 3 to reduce the reserve requirements of the banks as a last resort; since the Fed has been selecting the method in the past that would help the banks the most do not be surprised if the reserve requirements are reduced ahead of open-market operations.

BANKERS GOBBLEDYGOOK

The other day you saw a headline that a certain prominent person says he is going to spearhead the fight in the Congress to reduce the reserve requirements of banks to the level advocated by the American Bankers Association. Now, that does not have any bad meaning. It does not seem to indicate anything that is wrong. There is nothing there to attract your attention. But, if you evaluate it and analyze it to see what the American Bankers' Association recommendation means, this is what you will find. It is to reduce the reserve requirements of the banks—all banks—clear across the board to 10 percent. They

are now 12 to 24 percent depending upon whether central city, reserve city or country banks. The American Bankers Association says that we should reduce them to 10 percent for all three categories. How would that affect the banks? The Federal Reserve banks have about \$19 billion in reserves of the commercial banks. The commercial banks have made loans aggregating six times that much and they are receiving interest on it because they have that reserve of an average of 1 to 6, which is all right, under our fractional reserve system, which I do not oppose. But, if you change the present reserve requirements and say that we will only have 10 percent reserves that means that there will be \$6,300,000,000 released to the banks and where the banks did not have that money yesterday, if that is done today, they will have \$6,300,000,000 more today. That means that they have that much free money given to them without charge. That means the banks can issue \$63 billion in money by making loans and discounts, in addition to what they have today, without paying out one extra penny; if they can get the reserves reduced to 10 percent. That is what that headline means. Nobody would notice it unless they had given some particular thought and attention to this question.

CAMPAIGN ON NOW

But the truth is that means that a campaign is on right now in the United States, in broad daylight, trying to get Congress to reduce the reserve requirements so that banks will have \$6,300,000,000 handed to them on a silver platter, upon which they can issue \$63 billion of new money. Nobody denies that. It is here in the papers in the language I quoted. We know it. They are trying to get Congress to do it.

That is not the right way to stop the recession-depression. There are places all over the United States where banks could be used. They are needed. But the tendency and the trend, which is a bad one, is to reduce the number of banks and to permit the concentration of banking resources. Today they are dangerously concentrated.

During the last 4½ years, up to June 30 of last year, the end of the last fiscal year, there were 860 banks during this 4½-year period that were absorbed by other banks or discontinued. There were only 427 new banks established during that period. How long will it take us to have a very few banks doing all the banking business in the hands of a few people if this trend continues as it has during the past 4½ years? We only have 13,000 commercial banks now compared to 30,000 25 years ago. So I say that instead of reducing the reserve requirements and giving a bonus, you might say, to existing banking institutions of \$6,300,000,000, which do not need that bonus—they are getting along all right now and making good profits—we should permit the establishment of other banks and let those other banks expand and serve communities that are not now served with adequate banking facilities. But certainly that method of reducing

reserve requirements should not be used first in the recovery program.

MORE DEBT

Next, I do not like the idea of causing people to go into debt all the time for public buildings, like post-office buildings. There is a continuing clamor for more and more debt paper. We are being asked to endorse a program to build public buildings all over the country. I am for it, but it ought to be done by direct appropriations by Congress, because by the time we build the buildings through the lease-purchase arrangement and we get them paid for, the taxpayers will have paid as much in interest as the buildings cost. So that we will be paying for them twice. That should not be done. Certainly it is not very helpful in fighting the recession-depression.

JUDGE SMITH ANSWERED

A few days ago I was before the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives. During the discussion about the granting of a rule, my good friend, the Honorable HOWARD SMITH, who is chairman of the great Committee on Rules, made a statement about the Federal Reserve banking system and its relationship to commercial banks, which he had made one time before and which I did not say anything about. But this time I said to him, "Please do not make that statement any more, because that is just not the way it is, and I hope you do not say it again." So I let it go at that. But soon after the meeting was over, the judge wrote me a letter, and he said:

You remember the other day in the Rules Committee you made the statement that I was wrong in saying that the Federal Reserve banks invested their money in Government bonds. I was contending that the Federal Reserve banks were making a lot of money through the use of the funds of member banks held as reserves, and instead of paying the profits to the stockholders, which are member banks, the profits were paid to the Federal Treasury.

Then he writes me fully about his views on it.

Of course, I cannot ignore the letter, and I have answered the letter. I am placing his letter and my reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this date in connection with these remarks. I sent my reply to Judge SMITH, and I penciled a note and advised him that I was going to speak today, that I had a special order, and I expected to mention our correspondence, since it had been brought out in open session in the Rules Committee anyway, and if he wanted to be present I would be very glad to yield to him. I shall be very glad to know what the judge has to say about my answer to his letter.

The facts are these: The Federal Reserve banks hold the reserves of the member banks. That is true. But Judge SMITH is just mistaken, and the reason I am anxious to answer Judge SMITH is because many bankers hold this same view. Before our Committee on Banking and Currency it is not unusual for a banker to say: "Why, the banks own the Federal Reserve System." Of course, that is not true; there is not a word of

truth in it; they do not own the Federal Reserve System.

It is not unusual for a banker to speak out and say, "The Federal Reserve banks use our reserves to buy Government bonds, and they keep the interest on those bonds; they do not pay us any of it." That is Judge SMITH's statement, but it is wrong; it is not correct; it does not happen that way at all, and I am showing why in my reply to him.

A week ago, last Thursday, I made a speech here in the House in regard to the ownership of the Federal Reserve banks, and I think I showed conclusively that they are not owned by the banks at all; they are owned by the Government. The speech may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, 1958, pages 1871-1877. I think I showed conclusively there that the reserves mentioned by Judge SMITH are not used by the Federal Reserve banking system at all. They must be kept intact, not invested.

You know the fractional reserve system came from the old goldsmiths. The goldsmiths used to accept gold and give a receipt for it. They would keep that gold so that when the owner wanted the gold he could come there and the goldsmith would give him the gold back. But in the course of business they did not want to carry gold around with them. They would take the gold to the goldsmith and get a receipt from him that it was worth a certain amount of money. They would take that receipt and buy what they wanted with it. It passed from hand to hand as money, because it was money. The goldsmiths soon discovered that people very seldom came back to ask for their gold, so they began to put out more certificates than they had gold, for they found that as long as they had 10 percent of the gold on hand they could pay off anybody who asked for their gold. That is how there was established the custom of letting the goldsmith lend 10 times as much money as he had gold. The gold would be the reserve in the country.

We have a similar situation; we do the same thing, but that reserve cannot be lent out again. If that were done it would be doing double duty. It must be there when needed. It cannot be invested in anything; it cannot be used for any purpose, but the Federal Reserve banks keep it for the member banks. It is a real valuable service to the member banks; otherwise, the member banks would have to keep it in their own vaults or hire a place to keep it. It has got to be kept intact. The banks, by having the \$1 in reserve, make loans and investments on an average of \$6.

So it is absolutely wrong to say that the member banks are entitled to compensation for the use of their reserves, because the reserves are not used.

I am going to expand on my remarks and bring out some questions about this that I believe the Members will be interested in. A better way of explaining about the goldsmiths, the reserves, and our fractional reserve system is as follows:

RESERVES AGAINST DEPOSITS

A modern commercial bank, like the first national, in any city is required by

law and by necessity to maintain reserves against its deposits so that it will be in a position to pay out cash on demand of the depositors. The best way to understand the function of reserves in our modern banking system is to look back into banking history and see how the concept developed.

The medieval goldsmith was the forerunner of the modern banker and assumed this position through the safeguarding of funds. Before the invention of deposit money, gold, and other precious metals were the accepted medium of exchange. Throughout much of the history of civilization, it was necessary for persons transacting business to keep a supply of coin or bullion on hand. This was hazardous, as well as inconvenient. In the later Middle Ages it became common practice for persons owning gold and other precious metals to deposit them with the local goldsmiths for safekeeping. The goldsmith, of course, gave the depositor a receipt for his gold.

GOOD AS GOLD

It was not long before the depositors found that it was unnecessary to draw out the gold each time they had a payment to make. It became customary for buyers and sellers to consider the gold receipts to be as good as gold, and the receipts became a primitive form of paper money.

In time, the goldsmiths discovered that normally they might expect withdrawals of gold by the owners to amount to only a small fraction of the total gold on deposit with them. It was possible for the goldsmith, then, to lend out a substantial proportion of the deposited gold, which he did not own, but for which he could get interest, keeping on hand enough gold reserve to cover the demands that he might normally expect the owners of the gold to make on him.

In practice, the goldsmiths usually did not lend the gold itself. By this time, their receipts were widely accepted as the equivalent of gold; so they simply wrote out or printed additional gold certificates and issued these extra receipts over and above the amount of gold actually deposited.

In this way a system of money based on fractional reserves came into being—that is, gold reserves amounting to only a fraction of the note issue based on them. The goldsmith, in return for a small interest charge, was providing the community with a medium of exchange and a place for the safekeeping of deposits.

FROM GOLDSMITH TO BANKER

The modern bank developed slowly. Up to the War Between the States, American banks in general received deposits in coin or bullion—or their equivalent in paper—and issued notes of their own based on this reserve. This was essentially the same system as that of the early goldsmiths. The quantity of banknotes, issued as loans to customers, was several times as large as the reserve.

Loans of this sort were a transfer of credit. The borrower, whose personal credit was not generally known or accepted in trade, could go to the bank, establish his credit with it and, in return for the payment of an interest charge,

exchange his generally unknown credit for the generally accepted credit of the bank.

During the past century, with the growth of communication and trade, and with the establishment of better systems for the protection of the creditor, the credit of individuals has come to be more widely accepted for transactions in their own communities. This is evidenced by the tremendously increased use in recent years of the open-book account, or charge account.

In banking, the growth of individual credit has been evidenced by the greatly increased use of the demand deposit, or checkbook money, in place of banknotes.

Today the role of paper money has been largely taken over by demand deposits.

Thus the fractional reserve system of banking developed to its modern stature.

CHECKBOOK MONEY

Demand deposits are in effect created by commercial banks and are based on debt. The new debt may be either public or private. If, for example, a commercial bank buys a Government bond, the Government's bank account is increased, but no individual's bank account is decreased. But this is not true of a savings bank. There has been a net addition to demand deposits and hence to the money supply.

In precisely the same fashion, if a bank makes a loan to a private borrower, it does so by giving the borrower a checking account. No other depositor's bank account is diminished thereby and hence, by making the loan, the bank has created a net addition to the money supply of the country in the shape of a demand deposit.

Just as the creation of public and private debt through the banking system increases the money supply, so net decreases in debt owed to banks bring about reductions in the money supply, such a contraction being an important factor in the downdrag of a recession or depression.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I shall be glad to yield to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I have been reluctant to ask the gentleman to yield, realizing that he was following logic in the course of his discussion of the financial affairs of the Federal Reserve System and of the Nation, and I do not want to interrupt the train of his thought. I think, however, my distinguished colleague is correct in giving real thought to the matter of what is going to happen in the future and what we must do to bring this country back to a normal state of business operation. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to present this thought to him. I was down home in the last 10 days and while down there I discovered the tremendous amount of unemployment that has built up in my State of Louisiana. In fact, I was greatly worried and concerned about the situation that I found developing.

The employment office, which is financed by the United States, was far

behind in its work of handling unemployment benefits. In fact, I found the State office was 3 weeks behind in the handling of these benefits. As a result, I called, long distance, the State headquarters at Baton Rouge, which handles unemployment benefits, and asked what the trouble was. I was told by the manager of that office that the unemployment-benefit applications had built up so rapidly it was impossible to keep up with them, in spite of the increased number of persons that were employed in that office to handle the situation.

I say the situation the gentleman is concerned with is real. It is something right before the Congress and the country and we should give our thought, like the gentleman from Texas is doing, to the proper handling of our financial affairs so that we may work out something without having a serious, devastating depression.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana. We happen to represent adjoining districts. My district, of course, is in the northeast part of Texas and adjoins Louisiana. I have received information from the district I have the honor to represent very much like the information the gentleman has just given the House. It is a serious situation, there is lots of unemployment, and I believe the situation is much worse than the administration realizes. I am impressed that the President does not have the correct information or he does not realize the real seriousness of the situation today.

There are plenty of ways to stop an inflation, there are all kinds of weapons the Federal Reserve can use, but there is no weapon the Federal Reserve can use to start the country back quickly in a depression. They have never discovered one. You can try, but it is like pulling a string; you can pull but you cannot push a string.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Upon my return, I want to tell the gentleman that I appealed to the social security organization in Washington for assistance in Louisiana. They sent a man down there to investigate to see whether or not my report was correct. Day before yesterday the representative returned and stated that my report was correct and that they were authorizing additional help to be given to the Louisiana State office for unemployment benefits to try to bring them down to date so that the unemployed people in great distress would not have to wait 2 or 3 weeks before they would get the checks that were due them for unemployment benefits.

Mr. PATMAN. I wonder if the bill we have up now providing \$32 million is for that purpose? Is it to relieve distressed States?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I think that is one of the purposes of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. I understand efforts are being made to expedite the passage of that bill and I hope it is quickly enacted. The situation is very serious.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I took note of the gentleman's remarks that there was not a word that could be used to reverse a depression and start back on the road to prosperity.

Mr. PATMAN. No monetary action.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there is one word that does that exactly and that is the word "jobs." That is what this country needs.

Mr. PATMAN. You cannot do it quickly. It takes time, it takes planning. The Appropriations Committee, I understand, has knowledge of the fact that there are about 190 post offices ready to go, that the plans have already been drawn. The architects have made their recommendations, and if we were to appropriate the money right now, they could commence immediately and give jobs. But, if we go off on the theory that we are going to have local people furnish the money and then have a lease-purchase agreement to last 20, 30, or 40 years, that is going to take a lot of time and it will not be done quickly. I am talking about monetary weapons. There are plenty of monetary weapons that we can use to stop inflation, but there is no monetary weapon that you can use that you can be sure will start the country back from the depths of a depression. Even if you were to agree to furnish people money at a negative rate of interest or no interest at all, who would borrow that kind of money in a depression when they could not make any money by borrowing it? They just will not borrow it. So, there is no monetary means that you can use to force the country back like there are monetary means to use to hold down inflation, if we have inflation. So, I think we can afford to take the risk. We should be aggressive; we should be able to do something drastic, do it fast, do it quickly, and if we were to make a mistake, there are plenty of ways you can pull it back, plenty of weapons to stop the inflation. But, when our economy gets down too low, there is no means of quickly getting it back by monetary weapons.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to remind the distinguished gentleman from Texas that on Monday of this week I introduced a modified version of what is known as the Gore bill, which would set up a public works administration and provide an additional appropriation of half a billion dollars for public works construction.

Mr. PATMAN. That is fine; anything along that line is good, wonderful, and we ought to do more of it.

Now, down in the area represented by my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks], and myself, I was called by a constituent the other day who said, "I hope Congress is not worrying about a tax reduction." He said, "We are not worried about a tax reduction; we do not want a tax reduction; we want jobs for people; we want something done that will give people an opportunity to work." And, he told me how many people were

out of jobs in that particular area and how many people were working just 1 day a week or 3 days a week. They could not even pay their food bills. He said, "We do not care about taxes; it is not going to hurt us to continue to pay as much taxes as we are paying, and certainly saving \$50 per capita in taxes is not going to recover the country or cause the country to enjoy prosperity again, but jobs do help the country. So, what we need is not a tax reduction so much as it is job opportunities for people so they can work and earn a living, pay their debts, and buy the comforts and necessities, even the luxuries, of life."

Mr. BAILEY. One more question. I am greatly surprised that the statistics supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor are not adequate and they are not all-inclusive. I find that in instances where railroad workers have been furloughed they are not even counted in the list of unemployed. They are subject to a call back to work on, say, 24-hour notice. They are not even listed. I would like to remind you that 1 major railroad in the State of West Virginia has furloughed 7,400 conductors, firemen, and engineers because there is no transportation of coal. We have 4 of those major east-west roads in West Virginia with 25,000 or 30,000 unemployed that are not counted in the list as being unemployed; they are just furloughed.

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas and to compliment him on bringing this important matter to light. I will say that the district I represent in southern Illinois has about 15 percent of its work force unemployed, and I believe drastic action should be taken to relieve this critical unemployment situation. I again congratulate the gentleman for his splendid remarks.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

I want to say this about Judge SMITH. I have the highest regard for Judge SMITH, and there is nothing personal in this between us. He believes one way and I believe the other. He is a very fine, able, conscientious Member of the Congress and he serves his Congressional District and his country well. So it is just a question of difference of opinion here and nothing personal at all. I want to call on the Federal Reserve to do something to relieve this situation, to do something drastic, if necessary; go into the market first, the quickest way. The quickest way is for the Federal Reserve to go into the open market and buy Government bonds. That puts money into the hands of people and that money will put people to work. The money will be put to work. It will mean something right now, quickly, immediately. Not only that, it will mean reserves in the Federal Reserve banks so that the local bank can expand an average of \$6 to every one. It will do something right

now. I hope the Federal Reserve will do something like that.

In addition, I want to ask the President to consider calling on the Federal Reserve to take action.

They talk about the Federal Reserve being independent. The Federal Reserve is not independent of the President of the United States. The Federal Reserve is not independent of Congress. It is not independent of the Government. If that were true we would have four branches of Government. We would have the legislative, the executive, the judicial, and the Federal Reserve. That is not so at all. The Federal Reserve is constituted by law. It is the duty of the President of the United States under the Constitution to see that the laws are faithfully executed and the Federal Reserve Board would not think of turning down a reasonable request of the President of the United States.

The letters are as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 7, 1958.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR WRIGHT: You remember the other day in the Rules Committee you made the statement that I was wrong in saying that the Federal Reserve banks invested their money in Government bonds. I was contending that the Federal Reserve banks were making a lot of money through the use of the funds of member banks held as reserves, and instead of paying the profits to the stockholders which are the member banks, the profits were paid to the Federal Treasury.

I want to call your attention to a letter I have just received from the president of the Alexandria National Bank on the same subject, in which he sends me a statement of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond indicating its holdings in Federal securities and its earnings, and showing that of the \$37 million profit made by the Richmond bank, 87 percent was paid into the United States Treasury.

I was seeking to obtain your sympathetic consideration of the situation of the member banks of the Federal Reserve System. One, member banks are required to keep reserves of 12 percent of their checking accounts and 5 percent savings accounts on deposit with the Federal Reserve without interest, but should the member bank need temporary funds and borrow from the Federal Reserve, it would be, in effect, borrowing its own money back at interest. No such requirements exist with respect to State banks, which presents a strong temptation for members of the Federal Reserve System to get out of it.

Again, national banks are required to pay to the FDIC premiums not only for the deposits that are actually insured, but also for their municipal and government deposits that are fully secured by collateral and in no wise dependent upon the FDIC for security.

With a 52-percent income tax and the other handicaps mentioned above, national banks are finding it difficult to pay reasonable dividends to their stockholders and build up their capital accounts to the extent that conservative banking requires.

While all of this is going on, Congress puts national banks into a position of unfair competition with mutual institutions and building associations by virtually exempting the latter from taxation.

Sound banking institutions are of such primary importance to all of our people that I would hope your committee would give

some serious thought to the matters mentioned above.

Please return to me the enclosed letter from Mr. Dudley and the statement which accompanies it.

With best regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD W. SMITH.

FEBRUARY 10, 1958.

HON. HOWARD WORTH SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE: I am delighted to have your letter of February 7 concerning what you believe to be the ownership of the Federal Reserve banks and the source of the funds which the Federal Reserve System invests in Government securities. This gives me an opportunity to correct a misunderstanding of yours which I should have corrected long ago.

It is now plain that you are holding certain misconceptions which are shared by many other well-informed people, including experienced and practical bankers. These misconceptions are (1) that the reserves of the member banks of the Federal Reserve System are the source of the funds used by the System to acquire the Government securities which it holds, and (2) that the member banks are the owners of the Federal Reserve banks.

I can see how your holding these premises has put us at odds over the years with reference to many of the proposals I have made about the Federal Reserve System. And I now believe that if you had understood that (1) the Government securities held by the Federal Reserve System have been purchased by money created by the System, which is a liability on the United States, and (2) that the System is owned by the Government, not by the member banks, you would not have been opposed to the amendment which I wanted to offer to the debt increase bill which was, as I explained to the Rules Committee, to require the Federal Reserve System to purchase directly from the Treasury any or all Federal securities issued under the additional \$5 billion debt authority. Had you had a correct understanding of these matters I think you would not have opposed my resolutions for a monetary investigation (H. Res. 210 in the 84th Cong. and H. Res. 85 in the present Congress).

In your letter to me you state:

"You remember the other day in the Rules Committee you made the statement that I was wrong in saying that the Federal Reserve banks invested their money in Government bonds. I was contending that the Federal Reserve banks were making a lot of money through the use of the funds of member banks held as reserves, and instead of paying the profits to the stockholders, which are the member banks, the profits were paid to the Federal Treasury."

Let me take up first two facts on which we agree, namely (1) that the Federal Reserve System, if not the individual Federal Reserve banks, invests a lot of money in Government bonds (and other Government securities) and, (2) that the banks make a lot of money from interest payments on these securities, most of which is paid into the Treasury.

SOURCE AND DISPOSITION OF FEDERAL RESERVE INCOME

Certainly, the Federal Reserve System has purchased and holds tremendous amounts of Government securities. At the end of 1956, it held \$24.9 billion in Federal securities. Furthermore, substantially all of the income reported by the 12 Reserve banks comes from interest paid by the Treasury on these securities. Again in 1956 (because this is the last year for which we have a complete report) the total earnings of the 12 banks

was \$595.6 million, of which \$571.8 million, or 96 percent, came from interest payments from the Treasury. Gross earnings from the activities of the 12 Reserve banks—including their loans and advances to member banks and others—amounted to only 4 percent of the total income reported for the 12 banks. In other words, the income of the 12 banks resulting from any and all operations carried on by these banks (\$23.9 million) was very small indeed, and a great deal less than their actual expenses which, net of reimbursements, totaled \$121.2 million.

Now, where are these Government securities and what services do the Federal Reserve banks perform to earn the interest which the Treasury pays on these securities?

The fact is that all of these securities are retained in one bank—the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. The Government securities for all the 12 banks are bought and sold, when they are sold, by the Open Market Account, which is located in the New York bank; these securities are held in New York and the interest is collected on them there, and the interest income is then divided—it is really just a bookkeeping transfer—among the 12 banks on a pro rata basis, in proportion to the resources of the 12 banks. The separate banks never see these securities, and they do not make the decisions to buy or sell them, or when to buy or sell them. All such decisions are made by the Open Market Committee.

Now on the question of the System paying its "profits" into the Treasury: Prior to 1933, the Federal Reserve Act specified that the Reserve banks were to pay 90 percent of their net income, each year, into the Treasury. The other 10 percent could be added to surplus reserves, which reserves were required to be not less than the amount of the so-called stock paid in by the member banks. In 1933 the law was changed in connection with the setting up of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. In that year a substantial portion of the surpluses of the Reserve banks—which were by then well in excess of the "stock" liabilities—were transferred to the F. D. I. C., to provide the initial reserves against insured deposits. Accordingly, the requirement that Reserve banks pay a specified percentage of their net earnings to the Treasury was removed from the law, with the understanding that this was for the purpose of allowing those banks to build up their surplus reserves again. Those reserves have long since been rebuilt, and more, however, and the System has been paying approximately 90 percent of its net earnings into the Treasury. For example, in 1956 the System paid 89 percent of its net earnings to the Treasury for what the Board's annual report calls "interest on Federal Reserve notes outstanding" (the reason for so describing this payment will shortly become clear).

The financial institutions bill (S. 1451) which has passed the Senate and is now before the House Committee on Banking and Currency contains in it, among other things, a provision which would write the 90 percent requirement back into the law. The Federal Reserve Board has recommended this, although they have been unable to give any answer as to what they can do with, or what possible need might arise for, the surpluses continually accumulated by holding back the other 10 percent.

So much then for the fact that the Federal Reserve System buys, holds, and collects interest on large amounts of Federal securities. Comes now the question of where the System obtained the funds used to purchase these securities.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE USES THE CREDIT OF THE NATION TO INVEST IN SECURITIES, NOT MEMBER BANK RESERVES

Individual bankers have from time to time gotten the impression that member bank

reserves are used by the Reserve banks to purchase securities, or that these reserves are otherwise invested, but that is not true. I could quote you many authorities on this, but I will quote just a few.

In 1951 Marriner S. Eccles, who was then Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, wrote an article for the Federal Reserve Bulletin in which he said: "I want to say in passing that, contrary to a persistent popular fallacy, the Reserve System does not use reserves deposited with it by member banks to buy Government securities. As a matter of fact the System creates the funds used in open-market operations. These funds are in no way dependent upon such reserves as member banks carry with the Reserve banks." (Federal Reserve Bulletin January 1941, p. 15.)

In December 1956, William McC. Martin, Jr., the present Chairman of the Board of Governors was before the Joint Economic Committee, along with several other Reserve officials. As Chairman of this session, I questioned Mr. Martin closely on this point and got the same answer Mr. Eccles had given. I quote a portion of this record:

"The CHAIRMAN. The point I am trying to make, Mr. Martin, is, I am trying to answer a fallacious argument that is going over the country; No. 1, that these reserves that the member banks have in their Federal Reserve banks are used to buy these bonds, that is a fallacy, is it not?"

"Mr. MARTIN. That is a fallacy.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is a fallacy; it is not true.

"Mr. MARTIN. That is right. (Hearings, Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization of the Joint Economic Committee, 84th Cong., 2d sess., on Monetary Policy, 1955-56, p. 118.)

Now let's see what the American Bankers Association says on the subject. Early in 1955 a spokesman for that association was before the House Committee on Banking and Currency and, in passing, made a statement which repeated the mistaken notion that member bank reserves are used by the Federal Reserve System. I called upon the American Bankers Association to examine into this matter further and let me know what its position on the question is. I received a letter dated May 11, 1955, signed by Mr. George R. Boyles, chairman of the committee on Federal legislation of the American Bankers Association, which reads in part as follows:

"The association as a body has never issued an official resolution or policy statement on this point. Since solely a question of fact is involved, it is not to be expected that the association would have been officially recorded in its proceedings as affirming or denying that the Federal Reserve banks invest member bank reserves.

"It is generally recognized, however, that Federal Reserve bank operations and functions are distinct in that they do not use their deposit liabilities, which are the reserves of member banks, to purchase United States Government securities. Individual bankers and others have had the opposite impression from time to time, and it has been necessary for us, as well as the Federal Reserve banks, to correct such misunderstanding when the occasion has arisen. The accompanying memorandum, which was prepared by the economic research staff of the association, explains the subject in greater detail.

"We trust that this will clarify the point you raised, since it is never the intention of the association to create false impressions or to misconstrue facts."

The fact is that the Federal Reserve System has the power to create money, just as does the private commercial banking system; and the Government securities which the System holds have been purchased with such money created on the credit of the

Government. This money has been created principally through the issuance of Federal Reserve notes which the System obtains from the Bureau of Printing and Engraving only by paying the printing cost. At the end of 1956, the 12 banks together had among their assets \$24.9 billion in Government securities, and they had among their liabilities \$27.5 billion for Federal Reserve notes, including both those outstanding and those in their vaults.

Allow me to quote again from the 1956 testimony of Chairman Martin:

"The CHAIRMAN. You have \$24 billion worth of bonds. Now, those bonds were bought by giving of Federal Reserve notes in exchange for the bonds, were they not?"

"Mr. MARTIN. Well, Federal Reserve credit.

"The CHAIRMAN. What is that?"

"Mr. MARTIN. Federal Reserve credit. They were not specific—

"The CHAIRMAN. That is what I mean. But every one of them is an obligation of the United States Government; is it not?"

"Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.

"The CHAIRMAN. And that is what makes it good.

"Mr. MARTIN. That is right." (Hearings, *ibid.*, p. 118.)

Now I think we have established this crucial point: the Federal Reserve banks do not invest the reserves which the member banks deposit with them. Let me make, then, an added point: by buying Government securities, not only is the Reserve System not using reserves which, it might be argued, would otherwise be available for use by the member banks, but the System's purchase of these securities actually increases the reserves available for use by the member banks. The Federal Reserve Bulletin for February 1941 put this matter very simply, as follows:

"Not only do the Reserve banks not depend for their lending power on member banks, but they are themselves in a position to increase or decrease the lending power of these banks. When the Reserve banks buy United States Government securities or make advances, they put reserve funds at the disposal of member banks, and thereby increase their lending power. And, contrariwise, when the Reserve banks sell securities or reduce advances, they withdraw funds from other banks and thereby reduce their power to extend credit. By these means the Federal Reserve banks, as creators and extinguishers of reserve funds, are in a position to exert an influence on the cost and volume of bank credit. This is, in fact, their principal function as a monetary authority, and the policies pursued in performing this function are determined, not on the basis of the reserves available to the Reserve banks, but with reference to the economic needs of the country."

WHY MEMBER BANKS MUST DEPOSIT RESERVES WITH THE FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

Since the Federal Reserve banks do not use, or invest, the reserves deposited with them by the member banks, then we might review the reasons why the member banks are required to make such deposits. There are two reasons. First, it is easier for the supervising authority to police these reserves, to see that they are actually kept, by requiring them to be deposited rather than seeing to it that each member bank keeps the proper amount in its own vaults. Second, depositing the reserves with the Federal Reserve banks involves an important convenience and service to the member banks themselves. Since the first reason is self-explanatory, I will elaborate only on the second, and for this let me quote from the Federal Reserve Bulletin again:

"Federal Reserve deposits are required reserves of member banks and are also the most convenient medium for settling balances between member banks in the same

Federal Reserve district and between Federal Reserve districts; consequently, deposits held with the Federal Reserve banks, even above legal requirements, are rarely withdrawn by the banks. Individual member banks find it a great convenience to be able to draw checks on their balances with the Federal Reserve banks, but this results merely in shifts from the account of one member bank to those of others, without change in the aggregate."

THE MEMBER BANKS DO NOT OWN THE FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

I come now to another important misunderstanding expressed in your letter to me. This is found in your suggestion that the profits of the Federal Reserve System ought to be paid to the stockholders, which are the member banks.

If the member banks were really the owners of the Federal Reserve System they would have a most fabulous investment. They would own a system which operates on the Federal Government's power to create money and which has in fact created sufficient money to purchase and hold \$25 billion worth of interest-bearing securities of the United States Government, plus another \$27 billion of other kinds of assets.

The financial contribution of all the member banks—through purchase of the so-called stocks—amounts to about \$325 million. Thus in 1956 the stockholders' return on investment, if we can imagine that the banks own the System, would have been \$596 million in net profits, plus, of course, all of the free services which the banks received from the System, the total cost of which came to \$121 million. In other words, on the theory that the private banks own the Federal Reserve System, their return on the investment would have been about 220 percent in 1 year.

This so-called stock in the Federal Reserve Banks which the member banks hold does not, however, constitute ownership, and never has. The term stock is a misnomer. If it is compared to a stock at all, it can at best be likened to a nonvoting preferred stock drawing a specified rate of interest, and a very high one at that—6 percent. Yet this stock has certain highly distinctive features which prevent its being characterized even as a preferred stock. Let me quote from the record on these, and call your attention particularly to Chairman Martin's replies to my questions:

"The CHAIRMAN. All right.

"No. 2 is that the banks own the Federal Reserve Banking System, and it is run by the banks; it is operated for their benefit.

"That is a fallacy, is it not?"

"Mr. MARTIN. That is a fallacy.

"The CHAIRMAN. That stock, or that word 'stock,' is a misnomer, is it not?"

"Mr. MARTIN. If you are talking about stock in terms of proprietorship, ownership—yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, of course, that is what stock is; yes. Normally that is what stock is; when you say 'stock,' you mean a proprietary interest of some kind, do you not?"

"Mr. MARTIN. In the ordinary sense, yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is right, in the ordinary sense.

"Mr. MARTIN. You and I are in agreement that it is not proprietary interest.

"The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

"Therefore, this does not convey any proprietary interest at all, and the word 'stock' is a misnomer. It is not a correct word at all. It is just an involuntary assessment that has been made on the banks as long as they are members.

"Now, if they go out, the money is refunded to them. But as long as they are members, they get 6 percent annually on that.

"And as evidence of the fact that they do not have any proprietary interest, which you admit, is the fact that this so-called stock cannot be sold, it cannot be hypothecated, and as a convincing and unanswerable argument that the banks have no interest in the Federal Reserve System as such, financial or proprietary interest, the law specifically provides that in the event of the liquidation of a Federal Reserve bank, that after they get their \$300 million stock back, the Government gets everything else. That is right; is it not?"

"Mr. MARTIN. That is right."

"The CHAIRMAN. Now, if the banks had any proprietary interest in that, they would get what was left after liquidation, would they not?"

"Mr. MARTIN. Well, you and I are in agreement it is not proprietary interest."

"The CHAIRMAN. Yes."

"Therefore, the statement that the banks own the Federal Reserve System is not a correct statement, is it?"

"Mr. MARTIN. The banks do not own the Federal Reserve System." (Hearings before a joint Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization of the Joint Economic Committee, 84th Cong., 2d sess., December 1956, pp. 119-120.)

The history of this unique stock shows that when the Federal Reserve System was set up, the member banks were required to make a small, nonvoluntary interest-bearing contribution to the System, which was to serve merely as a psychological device. It was intended to make the bankers feel that they had some direct financial stake in the success of the new System. The law provided that each member bank could be called upon to contribute an amount up to 6 percent of its paid-in capital and surplus. Actually the banks were called upon to contribute only 3 percent, and this is the figure which still prevails.

I have frequently questioned Federal Reserve officials about the use of the funds derived from sales of this stock and the answers I have received are that their use, if any, is still psychological; the funds are not invested. Obviously the System does not need them, and it is my own belief that the psychological effects, if any, are no longer needed. Consequently, I have frequently made the point that the funds should be returned, so as to save the 6 percent interest, which amounts to about \$19 million per year.

SUMMARY

Judge, this has been a long letter, but I believe it will prove to be worth your time if it succeeds in clearing up the following points:

1. Although private bankers in very large degree manage the Federal Reserve System, the System is owned by the United States Government.

2. Since most of the yearly cost of operating the Federal Reserve System—about \$121 million—goes for check clearance and other free services for the private banks, this yearly cost is a direct subsidy to the private banking system, although the general public benefits indirectly, by having an effective banking system.

3. The Federal Reserve System does not use the reserves of the member banks to buy Government securities.

4. Purchases of Government securities by the Federal Reserve System, instead of denying the private banks use of reserves, actually increase the amount of reserves available to the banks for loans and investment, which means that the Federal Reserve System can and does increase the money supply in either of two ways—by buying Government securities or by reducing required reserves and thus allowing the private banks to create the new money.

I am,

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

RIVER NAVIGATION IN 1958

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who preceded me. I am very much impressed by a great many of the ideas that he presented in his statement to the House in reference to the financial situation of the country. Over many years he has made a study of the finances of the Nation and his remarks, of course, should be given the consideration that we would give to someone who has made a lifetime study of finances and who is recognized as an able scholar in government and in domestic finances.

However, I am not here today to talk to you about finances. On the contrary, I want to talk to you about river navigation. There is a great deal of loose talk going around the country at this time to the effect that the United States cannot afford to launch satellites if it continues to develop its water resources. Such ideas are, in my opinion, the product of hysterical and immature thinking.

In all of this current discussion of sputniks and missiles and outer space, there are many earthbound problems of great importance that still abide with us. One of these problems is the development of our inland waterways.

Speaking as the ranking majority member of the House Armed Services Committee which is directly concerned with the sputnik-missile problem, I am deeply disturbed, and, speaking as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, which is directly concerned with the orderly development of the Nation's water resources, I am equally disturbed. These are formidable problems that the new space age has thrust upon us.

It is especially important at this time to keep our wits about us and view both problems—the sputnik program and the waterway development program—in proper balance and perspective.

It is my conviction that the American people can face up to both problems at the same time and solve both of them successfully. We must solve them both in the twin interest of our defense and economic well-being.

Defense and economic development walk hand in hand. We have had relatively recent proof of how the two are intimately related. I speak of the role that inland waterways played during World War II and the Korean conflict.

During World War II the waterways of the United States demonstrated their essentiality in any sound system of national defense. While ships were being sunk by the German submarines off the coast of Florida, people on the Atlantic seaboard were saved from freezing by oil that was transported by the waterways to Pittsburgh and thence distributed through railroads, tanks, trucks, etc. As a result of this crisis, a special session of the National Rivers

and Harbors Congress was held in Chicago. This resulted in the passage of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1942, which authorized the construction of the cross-Florida barge canal.

In any war of the future the inland waterway system may have to meet greater emergency demands than ever before. What if problems like these arose? What if the Panama Canal were knocked out by an atomic missile from an enemy submarine? What if enemy missiles hit and paralyze the great rail centers of the Nation? In such emergencies the inland waterways would have to carry much of the bulk cargo that must be hauled from place to place to keep the Nation alive.

When World War II and the Korean conflict occurred, our inland waterway system admirably served the purposes of national survival. In future wars, when our own soil may become a target and battleground, our waterway system may very well enable us to survive and win again.

An interesting question arises at this point, How much traffic is our waterway system carrying today? The answer is that the system is operating at record capacity.

The latest figures for 1956 show that United States waterborne commerce reached a new all-time high. For the second time in history waterborne commerce exceeded a billion tons.

Figures compiled by the Army Corps of Engineers for 1956 equaled 1.93 billion tons, as compared with 1.16 billion in 1955, the previous record year.

Tonnage for the Gulf ports was very impressive during 1956. The figures show the following tonnage for the leading Gulf ports:

New Orleans, La.....	50,700,000
Houston, Tex.....	52,300,000
Beaumont, Tex.....	25,700,000
Mobile, Ala.....	17,500,000

Figures for other leading ports in the Nation are:

	Tonnage
Boston, Mass.....	21,000,000
New York, N. Y.....	154,700,000
Philadelphia, Pa.....	55,700,000
Baltimore, Md.....	51,600,000
Norfolk, Va.....	44,600,000
Los Angeles, Calif.....	19,600,000
Richmond, Calif.....	14,800,000
Portland, Oreg.....	13,800,000
Seattle, Wash.....	13,700,000

Coastal areas having a concentration of harbors include the following, with total 1956 tons: Delaware River, from Trenton, N. J., to the sea, 109,200,000; Hampton Roads, Va., 71,700,000; San Francisco Bay, Calif., 44,200,000; Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers, Oreg. and Wash., 20,900,000.

Among the leading Great Lakes ports in the 8 States bordering the lakes were the following, with 1956 tonnage:

Duluth-Superior, Minn. and Wis..	59,400,000
Two Harbors (Agate Bay), Minn.	16,000,000
Milwaukee, Wis.....	8,600,000
Chicago, Ill.....	44,600,000
Indiana Harbor, Ind.....	19,400,000
Detroit, Mich.....	27,100,000
Toledo, Ohio.....	36,000,000
Erie, Pa.....	6,500,000
Buffalo, N. Y.....	22,200,000

Following is a breakdown of the 220 billion ton-miles of freight carried on the inland waterways in 1956:

Gulf Coast waterways.....	15,021,000,000
Mississippi River system.....	56,786,000,000
Great Lakes system.....	110,665,000,000
Atlantic coast waterways.....	32,302,000,000
Pacific coast waterways.....	5,199,000,000
Other waterways.....	3,000,000

As impressive as are the figures with regard to the wartime and postwar use of our inland waterways, I am afraid that we have lagged behind the Russians in the development of our water resources. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress was the first to call public attention to the size and scope of the Russian waterway program.

In the process of building their satellites and missiles, the Russians have not been so shortsighted as to suspend their activities in the field of water development.

Even while the finishing touches were being put on the two sputniks, a Russian delegation was telling an International Navigation Congress in London about Russia's rather expansive plans and projects to improve her system of water transportation.

This information was brought back from London by Clarence R. Tull, harbor engineer at Baltimore and a national director of the Rivers and Harbors Congress, who was an official United States delegate to the International Navigation Congress held in England last July.

At that meeting, Prof. V. V. Zvonkov, of the U. S. S. R. Academy of Sciences in Moscow, and others of the Russian delegation, read papers disclosing quite frankly—the Russians sometimes surprise us with their unexpected frankness—these hitherto-unreported facts.

First. Cargo ships driven by atomic energy are being designed and worked on.

Second. Under the current 5-year plan, 19 big new ports will be started at undisclosed locations, according to Professor Zvonkov.

Third. Seven reconstructed ports will soon be commissioned on the Volga, and 2 in Siberia at Omsk and Osetrov.

Fourth. Twenty-five or 30 new rail-water terminals are planned before 1970.

Fifth. Automation and electrification of the whole inland waterway system is being pushed.

Another Russian project that Mr. Tull reported back to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress last summer was the construction of an atomic-powered icebreaker. This icebreaker was launched only a few weeks ago, and photographs were run in newspapers here and throughout the world. These pictures were impressive evidence that the Russians are doing exactly what they predicted they would do last July.

Upon his return from London last summer, Mr. Tull made this observation, based upon his study of the Russian reports:

The Russians have been applying their best scientific brains to the problem of unlocking the seas that surround them on every side. They are developing long-range ice forecasting; they are blasting and bombing ice formations from the air, and are

developing new techniques in Arctic navigation. They are experimenting with thermite explosions and are talking about the use of atomic energy (which produces even more heat than thermite) to blast away ice barriers.

These and other reliable reports indicate that the Soviets are continuing their basic water development program, along with their sputnik-missile program—side by side—hand in hand. The evidence is also plain that they are continuing their basic economic development program without diminution. They are carrying out concurrent programs to develop sputniks and waterways, all at the same time.

My thought is that if the Russians can afford to push both these programs side by side, so can the American people.

I suppose that some of our more composed, comfortable and complacent editorial writers would denounce Russia's imposing waterway program as "so much pork barrel." Some of our editorial writers have used the phrase, "pork barrel" to oppose many worthy projects in the American water development program.

But, with reference to these editorial writers, we must remember that they speak from rather sheltered ivory towers. The chances are that they have never seen the Mississippi or the Volga in flood. And so they can talk rather glibly about developments and disasters that they have never seen.

Many people ask what are the prospects for appropriations for civil works during the next fiscal year 1958. In a speech which I delivered before the Inland Empire Waterways Association at Longview, Wash., on October 29, 1957, I predicted that there would be a fierce scramble in Washington for the crumbs that will drop from the appropriations table after defense demands are satisfied.

The next budget has cut construction by as much as 7 percent over last year and will provide no money for starting new projects. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is strenuously opposed to any such curtailment of the civil works program.

Friends of the waterway development program will have to rally in opposition to such drastic cuts. They must also rally to put through Congress the omnibus authorization bill, which is so badly needed and which is slated for strong opposition.

The suggestion that the water resources development program be tossed out the window is the product of hysterical thinking. It is not the product of a well-thought-out program. It is a haphazard proposition that is intended to create the impression that we are doing something when there is no evidence that this is the thing that must or should be done to attain the goal.

Keep these things in mind in the months that lie ahead as we strive to strike a sensible balance in the allocation of appropriated funds:

The launching of an American satellite will not protect a single city, plant or farm from floods; it will not reduce the crest of the country's next disastrous flood by 1 foot.

The development of rockets and missiles will not make waterways, railroads and highways obsolete—at least not in our time. They will not transport the vast tonnages of freight that must be moved from place to place in our complex, interdependent 20th century civilization.

And also keep this in mind before jumping off into the wild blue yonder—no rocket or missile or satellite has yet been devised that will stop the flow of the Volga or the Mississippi.

We must use our resources and our wisdom in these times of great decisions to see that the Mississippi, the Red River, and other great streams of this country are not neglected or allowed to run wild and unrestrained in times of raging floods.

In a speech in New Orleans on December 5, 1957, Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Chief of the Army Engineers, made a detailed report on Russia's program in developing her waterways. He observed that in revitalizing our own military defense program, "there will be increased competition for the taxpayers' dollars"—an observation that I had previously made. Then he made this additional comment which should be noted carefully when we consider the proper balance and relationship between the military program and the development of our water resources. He said:

We would be very negligent if we did not build up our national economy so as to be in a better position to support a greater national military effort in advance of the possible initiation of war.

It follows that now, more than ever before, as part of our national improvement program, we should develop our water resources and protect our industries, farms and homes from flood damage and destruction.

Thus, to my mind, the new era of military preparedness encompasses a new natural resource development age which is an integral part of what must be our broad program to meet the severe demands of national preservation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in what the gentleman says about navigation and water conservation, because we have those problems in our own area. The gentleman is president of one of the fine organizations in the United States, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. It is a powerful organization. I hope he gets his organization behind these many projects that are so badly needed in our section of the country.

I notice that they are going to have a convention soon in Washington, D. C. I know that he will make every effort to get back of these projects. I want to commend him for the fine fight he has made over the years for water conservation and navigation and I should be very glad indeed to work shoulder-to-shoulder with him in that effort.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I certainly thank my colleague. I want to say that we are going to have a convention in Washington, D. C., in the middle

of the month of May, a convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. At that time we wish to take up the problems of internal navigation in the United States and try to put our shoulder to the wheel, so to speak, to help out on this program.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who has just spoken, lives in the valley of one of our great waterways in the Southwest; it is the Red River Valley. I also live in that Red River Valley. My people live in the heart of that valley. We are deeply interested in the development of the Red River Valley. But today, generally, I am not speaking about the development of the Red River Valley any more than I am speaking about the development of any other river valley in the United States that needs development and is capable of that development.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not flood control come into the gentleman's deliberations?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Certainly, flood control is foremost in my thought and mind when I discuss river development.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The head of the Army Engineers stated that the Merrimack River was a No. 1 project in New England today for action. We are hoping to get more money in the next bill for that flood control, because if we have a flood, if we have high water both in the Concord and Merrimack Rivers, Lowell might very well be wiped out.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The Merrimack River in New England is very important. In fact, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, of which I am president, has passed resolutions in support of some of the developments along that great waterway in New England.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is industrialized. The gentleman knows how much I appreciate what his Rivers and Harbors Congress has accomplished.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We are trying to do a job for the people of the United States. I am firmly convinced that the Nation if it is going to be sound and strong economically must continue to develop itself internally, that you cannot reach a static condition as far as your internal economy is concerned and expect to go on and continue to develop militarily as the most potent and powerful nation the world has ever seen. I think the two are linked together and that you must develop yourself internally as you develop yourself externally. That is my philosophy. So I want to thank the gentlewoman very much for her very able observation.

I am not going to cover all the figures I have here today. I have many of them. The latest figures for 1956 show that the United States waterborne commerce reached a new all-time high for the second time in history. Waterborne commerce exceeded 1 billion tons in 1956. The figures of the Army Corps of Engineers for 1956—the 1957 figures are not yet out—equal 1,093,000,000 tons, com-

pared with 1,016,000,000 tons in the year 1955, which has the previous record year.

Tonnage for the gulf ports reached an impressive figure during the year 1956. These figures show the following tonnages for the leading gulf ports: New Orleans, 50,700,000 tons; Houston, Tex., 52,300,000 tons; Beaumont, Tex., 25,700,000; and Mobile, Ala., 17,500,000 tons.

The figures for the leading ports throughout the Nation generally show Boston, Mass., with 21 million tons; New York, N. Y., with 154 million tons; Philadelphia, Pa., with 55,700,000 tons; and Baltimore, Md., with 51,600,000 tons.

Mr. Speaker, these figures, together with other figures which I have here prepared and which I want to present to the Congress of the United States, are not only very persuasive, they are extremely impressive. They indicate very clearly that even in normal times of peace, the waterways of the Nation are vital to sustaining our economy and that if we are going to continue to improve our position financially, strengthen our position domestically, and continue our march of progress as a world power, we must continue our program of internal development of our waterways throughout the length and breadth of the United States.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. PATMAN. It is my understanding, and I am sure the gentleman knows about it, too, that the Bureau of the Budget is slowing up some projects involving flood control and water conservation by not permitting the contracts to be let at this time. Does the gentleman not think in view of the recession which is now admitted by the administration that the Bureau of the Budget should immediately and quickly release these funds so as to give people more jobs and as many jobs as possible as quickly as possible.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I know of no better way to invest the money of the Nation, and at the same time provide jobs quickly than to do just exactly what the gentleman has suggested. I would go further, too, and I would ask the Bureau of the Budget to release a program of new starts because the Bureau of the Budget has announced the policy of "no new starts" in our inland waterway development. We should release a program of "new starts" approved by the Congress already and a part of our law at this time, and with these recommendations for new starts before the Congress, we can affirmatively put into law by appropriations the money we need which is necessary to go ahead with our inland waterway development.

Mr. PATMAN. It is generally known, I believe, that in Soviet Russia they are not neglecting their internal improvements. Why should we neglect our internal improvements? Does the gentleman not think that we should pay just as much attention to the development of our country internally through navigation, water conservation, flood control, and soil conservation projects as any

other country in the world? That should be a challenge to us not to let Russia get ahead of us in internal improvements.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Certainly that is so. While the Soviets have committed many blunders, and I do not hold them up as an example, I do want to say that they are moving forward in their internal waterway development. I want to point out that Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner is Chief of the Army Engineers. He is a great soldier and he had a great record as an engineer in World War II. He had a great record for waterway development prior to World War II when he held the position of colonel, lieutenant colonel, and major. Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Chief of the Army Engineers, observed in the city of New Orleans on December 5, 1957, that there will be increased competition for the taxpayers' dollars. He said that that was an observation that he had previously made. Then he made this additional comment. It should be carefully noted when we consider the proper balance in the relationship between military programs and the development of our water resources:

We would be very negligent if we did not build up our national economy so as to be in a better position to support a greater national military effort in advance of possible initiation of war.

And continuing the quotation, he said further:

It follows that now more than ever as a part of our national improvement program, we should develop our water resources and protect our industries, farms and homes from flood damage and from devastation.

In conclusion, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the course of the general's remarks, he gave certain data and figures regarding the use of the waterways and the development of the waterways of Soviet Russia, that amazes anyone to learn of the vitality which those people are placing behind the internal development of their domestic waterways.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ULLMAN. I want to commend the gentleman for the very strong position he has taken on this important matter of river development, and in his position of responsibility he can do a great deal to keep this program moving. We in the Pacific Northwest are vitally concerned with the river-development program, because we have our great Columbia River system. We are also concerned with great public works, because unfortunately we are the really distressed area of the Nation. My own State has 13.6 percent unemployment. The State of Washington and the State of Montana are right behind us. We also have on the river a great project known as the John Day Dam. The administration has cut this program way back. If we cut the program back to the point they recommend, we will lose a great deal of money. So I commend the gentleman for his excellent remarks.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman.

May I say in reply to that I had the privilege of journeying out to the Columbia Basin during the intermission. I had the privilege of addressing the Inland Empire Waterway Association in the State of Washington. I saw a very fine group of people, sincerely and enthusiastically interested in the development of that great waterway out in the Pacific Northwest. We ought to give them the support in that area which a great area is entitled to receive, in helping them with that program.

Mr. ULLMAN. May I say to the gentleman I am very happy he was able to come out to the Pacific Northwest. I hope he was well treated.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I was wonderfully treated by your people. They are fine and hospitable and patriotic. The Inland Waterway Association is doing a great job and its executive vice president is an able leader.

Mr. ULLMAN. That is fine. The Inland Waterway Association is an excellent association, having high ideals.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I would like to associate myself with the views of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, the dean of our delegation, and commend him for the great work he is doing for rivers and harbors and flood control; and also commend the gentleman for the great job he is doing as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and assure him that the members of the Louisiana delegation stand behind him.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman very much. I want to express pleasure in having our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], back on the floor, working actively with us again, doing a great job for the people of the Nation and for the people of his own district in Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SISK. I want to commend the gentleman also on the great work he is doing heading up this Rivers and Harbors Congress. I have been very much concerned about what I understand to be certain cutbacks in the program of the Corps of Army Engineers. The particular field which I am going to mention—I do not know whether the gentleman is familiar with it or not, but it has to do with a certain program on four projects regarding recreation. It was my understanding that the Corps of Engineers has asked originally for something over \$1 million to do some very much needed work along that line. The Bureau of the Budget has denied every penny of it. People generally throughout the Nation are concerned over the fact that apparently they are going to be denied money even for maintenance—for taking care of those projects which the corps has heretofore been maintaining. I wonder if the gentleman has any

comment on that or whether he is familiar with that part of the program.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I am not familiar with that part of the program, but generally speaking my position is that the Bureau of the Budget now completely controls the waterway development program of the Nation. We in the Congress can ask, we can provide funds, we authorize a program to proceed, but we have no assurance whatsoever that it is going to proceed even after all the studies the Engineers make, and the people at home make. For instance, in the Red River Valley we can have our Red River Valley Association. They can study a program. They submit it to the State of Louisiana, the State of Texas, or the State of Arkansas or Oklahoma. Then the States study the program. They approve it. The Engineers get hold of the program, study it and approve it as a program, and it is finally submitted as a well-thought-out program to the United States Congress. The Congress then authorizes it and subsequently appropriates funds for it.

The program, after all of that thought, study, effort, and investigation is turned over to the Bureau of the Budget where one or two men decide whether or not that project after all that preparation is worthy of consideration by the Nation in its program of internal development.

That is all wrong.

Mr. SISK. That is exactly the point I was concerned with, because the point, as I brought out, has to do with programs that all the people of the country are concerned with, not one particular locality. These are being denied by the Budget even to the extent of denying operation and maintenance charges, or even allowing the digging of a well or the repair of sanitary facilities. I think it is something that should cause Congress concern, that the Bureau of the Budget steps in and denies completely funds for projects of this kind which are so essential and which are so needed by the American people.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE BENSON FARM PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today for appropriate reference legislation which I believe offers a sound approach to the farm problem.

Secretary Benson's failure during the past 5 years has been not so much that he has scuttled the old support program, but that he has failed to provide an alternative plan of action for the farmers. He has dedicated himself to a campaign of knocking the props out from under the program of the previous Democratic administration and has offered the farmer nothing in its place. Benson's program has been one of backing the old car down the road and, as the ruts get deeper, throwing the seat and all the accessories overboard in order to keep the old rig going backward. Well,

it is a stripped car now and we have a lot of stripped farmers to prove it.

The only consistent program in these past 5 years is a determined effort to push lower and lower the price supports and the earning power of the farmers. The only consistent theory of Mr. Benson and his associates has been that there are too many farmers and that more and more should get out of the business.

Let us compare briefly the farm situation as between 1947 and 1956. In 1947 gross farm income was \$34 billion, which was 14.6 percent of the gross national product. In 1956, gross farm income was still about \$34 billion, but the rest of the economy had moved ahead to the point that farm income was only 8.2 percent of the total national product.

In 1947, Americans had a total personal income of \$197.2 billion. The farm share was \$17.1 billion, or 8.6 percent. In 1956, total personal income had risen to \$342 billion, out of which the farmer received \$11.5 billion, or only 3.3 percent. The farm population is 13 percent of the total, yet farmers receive only 3.3 percent of the national income. Last year the average family spent \$1,500 for food, but only \$465 went to the farmers and \$940 went to the processors and the handlers.

Yes, we have a sick agricultural economy and yet all we get from this administration is statistical platitudes attempting to hoodwink the farmers into the belief that they are really prosperous, that all of the struggle and hardships and red ink are only some kind of dream.

Let us turn to the crux of the farm problem. In our present economy manufacturers operate within a system of administered prices. Operations are premised on the rule that the sale price shall cover the cost of producing goods plus a reasonable profit. In order to prevent adverse market conditions, such producers generally can control production to prevent burdensome surpluses. Farmers, however, discounting the price support system, operate in a free market and depend upon the law of supply and demand. They take what they get without regard to production costs or profit. They are the only large segment of our economy devoid of a system which passes the costs along to the consumer. This fact is really the crux of the farmer's problem.

I think it well to look at another segment of our producing economy that some years ago faced the same basic problem as that now confronting agriculture—labor. In the great depression of the thirties, the problems of labor and the problems of the farmer were at the forefront. In both instances Federal legislation was enacted. Labor, however, asked for and got Federal protection for the right to seek its economic goals through industrial organization, thereby creating an effective bargaining position. Agriculture, on the other hand, turned to direct Government participation, with prices supported by law and direct Federal purchases through the Commodity Credit Corporation. Nothing was done then to improve the farmer's bargaining

power beyond allowing him to sell to the Government in the event the market was weak.

This is not to say that the program did not fill a great need. I can think of nothing that has done more to remove the shackles from the farm segment of our economy than the organization of commodity credit loans. In addition, our REA and Farm Credit Administration programs and our soil-conservation measures have been landmarks of progress for the American farmer.

However, it did not correct the glaring weakness in the Nation's agricultural economy—its completely inadequate bargaining position in the market place.

Dr. Kenneth Galbraith, professor of economics at Harvard University, sums up the problem in these words:

The large corporation has a built-in bargaining advantage, based on its size and its position in the market. As a result, it is able to keep its prices in reasonable relation to its costs. Thus, it can minimize its market risks.

The position of the workingman was no better than that of the farmer until he changed it by organizing trade unions. These have enabled him to bargain effectively on the price of his labor.

Only the farmer has remained essentially unorganized.

What is the answer to this problem? Some might say it is in voluntary co-operatives. Certainly farm cooperatives have made a great contribution to agriculture and will always have an important role to play in any farm program.

But, in all frankness, I fear that, if we rely on farm cooperatives alone, the family farmer will have become a thing of the past before we solve the problem.

And so we come to the point where we must propose a solution. There are many roads we can take. There are conflicting philosophies and many opposed methods.

Putting it very simply, I feel that there is a real awakening today to the fundamental belief that the farmers will not improve their position until they organize on a nationwide basis to protect their interests. And I am firmly convinced that such organization must be on a commodity-by-commodity basis.

With this in mind, I took a long look at the structure of existing agricultural law. It soon became obvious to me that the logical vehicle to implement this objective was the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 which provides the framework for voluntary organization and the machinery for establishing marketing agreements and marketing orders. In this act, the following policies and objectives are set forth:

First, to establish and maintain such orderly marketing conditions for agricultural commodities in interstate commerce as will establish, as the prices to farmers, parity prices;

Second, to establish and maintain such minimum standards of quality and maturity and such grading and inspection requirements for agricultural commodities as will effectuate such orderly marketing of such agricultural commodities as will be in the public interest; and

Third, to establish and maintain an orderly flow of the supply thereof to

market throughout its normal marketing season to avoid unreasonable fluctuations in supplies and prices.

Consumer protection is achieved by prohibiting "the maintenance of prices to farmers above the level which it is declared to be the policy of Congress to establish in subsection 1 of this section." Such a level is defined as the parity level of prices—in other words, a price level that would give the farmer full parity in the market place.

These are sound objectives—essentially what we have been striving for in farm programs for many years.

The act further provides that marketing orders shall contain, as terms or conditions, methods for the limitation of the total quantity of any such commodity or product or of any grade, size, or quality thereof, produced during any specified period or periods which may be marketed in or transported to any or all markets in the current of interstate or foreign commerce. The method used to achieve these goals is control over the amount which can be purchased or marketed in interstate or foreign commerce by handlers of the affected commodities.

During the years since the enactment of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, the Department of Agriculture has gained widespread experience in the negotiation of commodity agreements and in the issuance of commodity orders. However, the act itself has had a very limited application because of certain provisions which make the scope of orders applicable only "to the smallest regional production areas or regional marketing areas," which the Secretary finds practicable.

What I am proposing in my legislation, is to change the intent of the act so as to realize national commodity marketing agreements and marketing orders which are, I believe, the only kind which will have any real effect on the bargaining position of the farmers in the market place.

I have also taken the necessary step of expanding the coverage of the act to include all field and seed crops, with the exception of wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and peanuts. Those basics are the subject of much complex legislation which it is not our intention to disturb. There is, of course, no reason why these basic commodities could not be brought under the umbrella of this type of legislation if producers should wish to do so. But I think this should only be done at the specific request of such groups and with a full understanding of the implications of such a move.

The existing law provides that the Secretary shall utilize agencies or committees made up of members of the commodity producing and marketing groups to administer the order. My bill provides that this shall be done on a national scale when a national order comes into effect. It also provides that national orders shall recognize the differences in production and marketing of commodities in the various production areas. This is obviously a practical necessity in a program of this kind.

The legislation I have introduced provides the following machinery for formulating and issuing a national marketing order:

Whenever more than 50 percent of the estimated total annual quantity handled in the United States of any commodity, other than milk or its products, is regulated by one or more orders, and the agencies administering the orders covering more than two-thirds of the regulated quantities of the commodity so propose and recommend, the Secretary shall give due notice of and an opportunity for a hearing upon a proposed order applicable to the entire United States or all production and marketing areas.

If a national order is then found practicable, the Secretary shall issue such an order.

Essentially, this legislation says to the farmer: Whatever the commodity you raise, you can now band together on a national basis. This is a means whereby you can free yourself from the arbitrary caprice of the speculators; whereby you can control the flow of your own commodity to the market places of America; whereby you can return to the farming industry a measure of self-respect, security, and adequate income.

I am well aware that any legislative proposal in the area of agriculture raises certain problems due to the complexity of the subject under consideration. But the problems of agriculture are not going to be solved until we tackle head on those complexities. I have great faith that the farmers of this country, given the opportunity and the machinery, will roll up their sleeves, sit down at the bargaining table with each other and resolve their differences into a workable national plan.

The farmers of America are at the crossroads. If they do not get together, if they do not organize to protect themselves, the farmer that we have known will disappear and in his place will be the contractor under vertical integration or the manager under some form of corporate organization.

The purpose of this legislation is to give the farmers the incentive whereby they can organize to protect themselves and to preserve those great institutions of private initiative and enterprise that have been so fundamental to the family farmer of this Nation.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I certainly want to compliment the gentleman from Oregon on the great amount of work and thought he has given to the legislation he is introducing. Coming from an area very similar in many ways to the area represented by the gentleman, I am much interested and particularly concerned about marketing orders. We have found in the great Central Valley in California that marketing orders have done more to improve and stabilize the income of the farmers in that area than any other single thing that we have ever been able to accomplish. I have been also concerned about legislation that would provide for national marketing orders in every commodity field, because I believe that in that way and through

the self-help method we can gain the support, support essentially of the consuming groups, because I think that is all-important. Today we must be able to protect not only the farmer in any program that we come out with, but we must be able to protect the consumer. A stabilized price, certainly I believe the gentleman will agree with me, will do that.

Mr. ULLMAN. That is correct. That is the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. SISK. In other words, it would assure the farmer a reasonable price and at the same time it would assure and protect the consumer from an extremely high price. I have recently introduced enabling legislation to provide for a national marketing order for the turkey industry. I feel that every segment of America today probably could be fitted into various types of marketing orders administered by people in that particular segment of the agricultural industry. We have, for example, a national marketing order for raisins in my district which has done an outstanding job.

SELF-HELP FARM PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress are deeply concerned and disturbed by the tragic failures of our farm program. They are convinced we must completely reevaluate the farm problem and arrive at sound, long-range principles which will assure hardworking farmers a fair income and consumers a fair price.

This is a complex problem and we certainly do not know all the answers. I am convinced we can make great progress toward a solution by improving and extending the self-help programs authorized under Federal marketing orders. These programs in essence are managed and directed by farmers themselves, without tax support or subsidies in the sense now used in our basic crop programs. They make good sense in many ways and have demonstrated that agricultural industries can be stabilized at price levels fair to producers and consumers.

Unfortunately, the laws authorizing Federal marketing orders contain defects which are currently interfering with the carrying out of these self-help programs and which are preventing more widespread use of them. These defects are ably and thoughtfully discussed in a letter I recently received from Mr. James H. Bryce, general manager of Diamond Walnut Growers, Inc., one of our successful and respected cooperative industries. While Mr. Bryce illustrates his discussion by references to problems of the walnut grower and other California specialty crops, his ideas and recommendations apply with equal force and logic to nonbasic crops produced throughout the United States which in the aggregate constitute a very large share of our agricultural economy. I am inserting herewith Mr. Bryce's letter and an accompanying table. I would like to commend it to the thoughtful attention of all those who share my concern with arriving at sound and workable solutions for our farm problems.

May I add one thought to those expressed by Mr. Bryce—I am completely

convinced that the parity formula as presently applied in the basic crop program must be modified or revised in the case of specialty and other non-supported crops, but this does not mean we can disregard the interests of consumers. If farmers are to have prices they receive stabilized at a reasonable level consistent with the economy of the country, they owe consumers a fair break too, and these programs must have provisions guaranteeing against skyrocketing of consumer prices in times of scarcity. If the farmer is to have assurances of a fair income, he must accept and agree to forgo his remote chance to make unreasonable profits at the expense of the public. It is a two-way street. I would like particularly to call the attention of my city colleagues to their opportunity to serve the housewife while they are helping the farmer.

Mr. Bryce's letter follows:

DIAMOND WALNUT GROWERS, INC.,
Stockton, Calif., January 8, 1958.
Congressman BERNIE F. SISK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SISK: As Congress reconvenes for its second session, it is most important that all members of the California delegation be keenly aware of the manner in which existing legislation penalizes certain important California specialty crop groups from the standpoint of parity. Mr. Anthony J. Tarlock, assistant manager of the Walnut Control Board, recently discussed this matter with a member of your staff in Fresno, but I regard it as of such great importance that I wish to recapitulate the information directly to you. I am writing to all members of the California House and Senate delegations along this same line.

Before going on, I should like to take the liberty of suggesting that your staff obtain a copy of a study entitled, "The Parity Limitation in Federal Marketing Orders," which was issued recently by the Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics in Berkeley. I believe this study will bring home to you the great importance of marketing orders to our California economy, since it shows how many of our agricultural industries depend upon such programs for market stabilization and quality improvement. Furthermore, it contains a wealth of statistical data and descriptive information concerning the whole parity question.

Marketing orders were originally conceived to permit farmers, through collective action with the assistance of the United States Department of Agriculture, to increase and stabilize their returns by means of volume and quality controls. The parity concept was formulated to establish goals for price improvement under such marketing orders. Thus, marketing orders are essentially self-help programs under which farmers really regulate themselves in order to improve their economic positions. In other segments of the agricultural economy, namely, those in which the Government expends money for price supports, the parity prices or percentages thereof have become floors above certain percentages of which the Government will not expend funds to advance growers' returns. Therefore, when a single formula is applied to determine parity prices which are goals for improved grower returns, as well as to determine parity prices which form floors, we get obvious conflicts because the goals are dragged down toward the floors. Because of the manner in which present parity legislation is written, it has the effect of establishing parity prices at the level of recent average prices, whereas the real objective of any marketing order is to

increase and stabilize grower-returns above an average level. Therefore, the present parity legislation really runs at cross purposes with the legislation authorizing the use of marketing-agreement programs to increase grower returns. For example, the parity price for walnuts has declined from \$676 per ton in 1949 to \$478 per ton at the present time. This is completely incongruous, in view of the present cost-price squeeze on our producers.

One of the most unfair features of the current parity formula is that the parity prices for specialty crops operating under self-help marketing-order programs are affected by operations that the Government carries out on the basic commodities. To quote from the aforementioned Giannini study: "Price support and other Government measures which raise the prices of certain commodities raise the prices-received index also, thereby lowering the adjusted base prices and parity prices of unsupported commodities" (p. 26). It seems to us completely unfair to have our parity price for walnuts affected by the amount of money the Government decides to spend or not to spend in supporting prices on commodities like wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, etc. This is especially so since the Congress has taken great care in protecting the parity prices of the basic commodities. For example, where a new parity is lower than an old parity, in the case of a nonbasic commodity such as walnuts, the transitional parity (a 5-percent change per year from the old to the new parity) commenced in 1950, whereas the annual 5-percent reduction in similar cases on basic commodities was postponed by Congress until January 1, 1956.

Attached is a special table which has been prepared to show various parity prices for basic and nonbasic commodities. This table definitely proves how well the basic commodities have been taken care of and how the nonbasic commodities, many of which operate under marketing agreements, have been slighted.

In the case of walnuts, existing parity legislation prevents us from utilizing the volume control features of our program unless the season average return to growers is less than \$478 per ton, which is an uneconomic level for the average walnut producer. Secondly, unless the volume control features of our marketing order program are in effect, it is not possible to go to the United States Tariff Commission and obtain a quota or fee on imports to prevent them from upsetting our domestic price structure. Finally, the present parity price means that our average grower return would have to swing to a very low level before we could obtain section 32 assistance in removing surplus quantities.

I regret that the technical nature of this problem requires a letter of this length, but I am sure you will agree that the importance of this matter to California specialty crop producers cannot be overestimated. Together with representatives of other specialty crop producers and with the assistance of research experts at the University of California, I hope to be able to work out a new concept for establishing price goals under marketing agreement programs. Until this new approach is formulated, I trust this letter will post you on the difficulties we are in, thereby giving you an opportunity to have a thorough grasp of this difficult matter when appropriate legislation is introduced to correct it. Should you require further information on this subject please do not hesitate to write me directly, or to contact our Washington counsel, Mr. Karl D. Loos, who is connected with the law firm of Pope, Ballard, and Loos, with offices in the Munsey Building.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. BRYCE,
General Manager.

Comparative parity prices

Indicated parity prices "old," "transitional," and "new" for basic commodities and for nonbasic commodities for which the effective parity price was the transitional parity price on Dec. 15, 1956, and effective parity prices, United States, Jan. 15, 1957.

Commodity	Unit	Old formula	Transitional parity price ¹	New formula	Effective parity prices Jan. 15, 1957
Basic commodities:					
Cotton, American upland.....	Pound.....	\$0.3670	\$0.3486	\$0.3656	\$0.3656
Extra long staple.....	do.....			.785	.785
Wheat.....	Bushel.....	2.62	2.49	2.39	2.49
Rice.....	Hundredweight.....	5.36	5.09	5.69	5.69
Corn.....	Bushel.....	1.90	1.80	1.70	1.80
Peanuts.....	Pound.....	.142	.135	.121	.135
Tobacco:					
Flue-cured, types 11-14.....	do.....	.545	.518	.558	.558
Burley, type 31.....	do.....	.528	.502	.566	.566
Maryland, type 32.....	do.....	.547	.520	.526	.526
Dark Air-Cured, types 35-36.....	do.....	.203	.193	.327	.327
Puerto Rican Filler, type 44.....	do.....	.376	.357	.304	.357
Nonbasic commodities:					
Grapefruit.....	Box.....	2.32	1.39	.847	1.39
Oranges.....	do.....	4.26	2.56	1.70	2.56
Avocados.....	Ton.....	1,030.00	618.00	333.00	618.00
Dates.....	do.....	594.00	356.00	128.00	356.00
Filberts.....	do.....	676.00	406.00	362.00	406.00
Walnuts.....	do.....	789.00	473.00	458.00	473.00

¹ For basic commodities 95 percent and nonbasic commodities 60 percent of the old formula.

NOTE.—Of the 164 commodities for which USDA computes parity, on Jan. 15, 1957, only 6—grapefruit, oranges, avocados, dates, filberts, and walnuts—had not yet reached the bottom of the transition, even though the old parity has already been reduced by 60 percent.

(Excluding the basic crops—of which as can be noted upland cotton has shifted to the new formula with only \$0.0014 drop from the old formula, rice with only a 33-cents-per-hundredweight drop; corn and peanuts will shift next year, and most of the tobaccos actually have a higher parity under the new formula.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMUNISM IN THE NAACP

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, until a few years ago the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was comparatively unknown and its activities received little national attention. Of late it has stepped up its nefarious activities to such an extent that it has now become almost as controversial an organization as the Communist Party itself. Indeed, most of the activities and general direction of the NAACP were all laid down years ago in Communist Party directives designed to divide our people and create suspicions, hatreds, and antagonisms which did not exist before.

The NAACP strenuously denies that it has any pro-Communist leanings, intent, or affiliations. So does every Communist-front and other periphery organizations. Some organizations which carry on activities which in the main parallel or support the Communist Party line possibly do so innocently and unwittingly. They either do not know what the main line of the Communist Party is, or, if they do, they do not care that it happens to coincide with their own policies and activities. Most organizations whose activities and policies parallel or indirectly support that of the Communists know exactly what they are doing and they were set up for that very purpose.

On March 26, 1947, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities as follows on the nature and purpose of Communist-front organizations:

The first requisite for front organizations is an idealistic sounding title. * * * Literally hundreds of groups and organizations have either been infiltrated or organized primarily to accomplish the purposes of promoting the interests of the Soviet Union in the United States, the promotion of Soviet war and peace aims, the exploitation of Negroes in the United States, work among foreign-language groups, and to secure a favorable viewpoint toward the Communists in domestic, political, social, and economic issues.

Mr. Hoover then laid down 14 easy tests to establish whether or not an organization was in fact a Communist front or had been infiltrated to such a degree that it might be considered as carrying out Communist policy to some extent. One of these tests was "Does the organization feature as speakers at its meetings known Communists, sympathizers, or fellow travelers?"

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 23, 1956, carries a long documentation compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities on the Communist front records of some 78 officers, staff members and others officially connected with the NAACP. This represented 44.1 percent of the NAACP's 177 officers and officials in 1954, amounting as it does to nearly half of its top officialdom.

If the NAACP is not a Communist-front organization in the narrow definition that it was specifically set up by the Communist Party then it certainly has an extraordinarily high percentage of top officers and officials with a curious predilection for Communist-front affiliations.

The Metropolitan Herald is a splendid and lively paper published in my district in Atlanta. Its February 5 issue

carried the following two-column news item on its front page. I consider this such an excellent yet brief summary of the current status and activities of the NAACP that I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

WALL STREET JOURNAL REVEALS NAACP, URBAN LEAGUE WORK FOR SAME GOALS; SAYS NAACP LOST MEMBERS IN 1957

Of interest to many southerners last week was an article appearing in the Wall Street Journal, telling of some of the trials and tribulations being encountered by the NAACP, leading agitation group whom most people blame with having stirred up racial discord in this area.

Especially interesting was one quotation having to do with the activities of the Urban League, which organization has been most controversial in recent community chest drives in the South.

Said the Wall Street Journal article, "Even organizations which share most of the NAACP's goals generally shun its militant means. 'We're trying to achieve the same end as the NAACP,' says an official of the National Urban League, an interracial group, 'but we prefer using the slower methods of education and community cooperation'."

This is most enlightening to those who have steadfastly charged the Urban League with being a pressure group, unworthy of community chest support.

Interesting too, in the Wall Street Journal article were the following statements: "The 48 directors of the combative, interracial National Association for the Advancement of Colored People met in Manhattan one recent morning to take stock of their battle scarred organization."

The article set out that membership in the NAACP dropped 14 percent last year for a loss in members of 48,000 and that the organization operated with a \$52,000 deficit for 1957. However, they still have slightly over \$200,000 in its reserve funds for use in creating incidents and filing lawsuits, etc.

The Wall Street Journal article said that Roy Wilkins, the 55-year-old executive secretary, claimed it would not slow down their efforts and that they still have 302,000 members.

The counteroffensives launched by many Southern States, notably Georgia, Alabama, Virginia and others, have tended to give the NAACP bushels of headaches and occupied their legal department with more than just the job of filing integration suits as Alabama, Virginia and others pass laws barring them from operation without payment of corporation taxes, making it mandatory to file membership lists and barring state employees from being members, etc.

While, according to the Journal, "since the violence in Little Rock, many friends of the NAACP's from the North and the South have been begging for a cooling-off period, to allow emotions to settle,"—"to an association founded in the abolitionist spirit, such strategy is unthinkable."

They quote Negro Attorney Thurgood Marshall as saying, "Two-thirds of the times that phone rings, it's some friend begging or cajoling me to slow down"—"why if I slow down any more, I'll be running backwards."

And speaking of Secretary Wilkins, they say he tells them, "If we let up now that we have the Supreme Court decision we'd lose a lot of Negro membership, a lot of liberal Northern support. Besides, we'd give Southern extremists more of a green light." (Any one opposing integration is an extremist in the eyes of the NAACP.)

"Rank-and-file members comprise most of the present board along with a generous sprinkling of such prestige people as Walter Reuther, United Auto Workers' president; Eleanor Roosevelt, wife of the former President; and former Senator Herbert Lehman, of New York."

Continuing, the article said, "Such name board members naturally help the association raise money and political support. About 85 percent of the NAACP's \$700,000 annual operating budget comes from members' dues of \$2 to \$10, with the rest rounded out by contributions. Reserve funds of \$246,644 last year came from donations and bequests. In addition, the branches collect over \$400,000 in local dues, and donations to a separate national legal fund exceed \$300,000 annually."

Among the immediate goals, according to Secretary Wilkins is to bring total Negro registration in Dixie to 3 million voters—45 percent more than is now registered in the 11 Southern States.

The entire article is most enlightening and should prove of interest to all those interested in preserving segregation. It furthermore makes the amount of money being spent by a few Southern States in the effort to prevent integration look like small potato spending.

Of equal interest is the fact that the conservative Wall Street Journal for January 30, saw fit to assign a special feature writer to do a special article on the NAACP. Normally the Wall Street Journal confines its front page to top financial, economic, or news of world importance. I regard it as highly significant that this conservative financial journal featured an exposé of the NAACP as column one, front page news.

Note carefully that Wall Street Journal focuses attention on a fact not generally known that this divisive organization was not founded by Negroes at all but by white radicals in New York. The current president of the NAACP, a New York attorney is white, as have been all of his predecessors. I commend this article in the Wall Street Journal to every fairminded Member of this body seeking a quick briefing on the history, purpose, and present status of this highly controversial agitational organization. The NAACP has done more than any other organization in this country to divide our heretofore unified people and to sow the seeds of hatred and dissension the end results of which no man can foresee. The article in the Wall Street Journal reads as follows:

NAACP SETBACKS—GROUP LOSES MEMBERS, RUNS DEFICITS, FIGHTS FOES' MOVES TO CURB IT—BUT LEADERS PLAN NO LETUP IN AGGRESSIVE TACTICS TO SPEED RACIAL INTEGRATION—PORTRAIT OF A PRESSURE GROUP

(By Louis Kraar)

NEW YORK.—The 48 directors of the combative, interracial National Association for the Advancement of Colored People met in Manhattan one recent morning to take stock of their battle-scarred organization.

The directors—from Atlanta educator Benjamin E. Mayes to former Brooklyn baseball star Jackie Robinson—counted some scars that are more than skin deep. A series of Southern State actions aimed at curbing the NAACP has contributed to these results:

Membership has dropped 48,000 or 14 percent, during the past year—the first decline since 1949. The association's operating budget shows a \$52,000 deficit for 1957. And the association faces long court fights defending itself against suits filed by Alabama and Virginia.

This stocktaking is of significance to a great many more Americans than those militantly engaged in promoting Negro interests. The NAACP has been a central figure in the race relations battles that have grown in intensity in the United States in recent months. It has been the most aggressive

leader in the fights to speed integration of schools, to increase the hiring of Negroes in northern and southern factories and to eradicate other evidence of what it considers discrimination against the colored race. Its strength and its strategy will have much to do with the intensity—and perhaps the success—of such efforts in the months ahead.

TIME IS LONG OVERDUE

The NAACP setbacks the board heard about at its recent meeting were described to the directors by the association's lean, impeccably dressed executive secretary, Roy Wilkins. The 55-year-old official, in his most rotund voice, added some words for those who wish the NAACP would slow down its integration efforts: "Our reply is that we're already going slowly, according to law and order, that 93 years have passed since emancipation and that we think the time is long overdue for us and our children to enjoy those rights."

This bit of oratory simply means the association, despite its setbacks, has no intention of becoming any less aggressive. Its strength remains considerable. It still counts 302,000 members. Its Washington lobby is influential. Its reserve fund now totals nearly \$250,000. To date its legal department has won practically every Supreme Court case it has undertaken.

The NAACP employs the same vigorous tactics today as it has used throughout its peppery 49-year history. It wages court battles up to the final appeal, eagerly solicits political support from both parties, maintains a constant, heavy public-relations barrage—and raises money to back all its sundry activities.

Through its local chapters, the organization manages to keep an astonishing number of irons in the fire. Recently, for example, the NAACP was simultaneously engaged in a school desegregation suit in Atlanta, a campaign for an antidiscrimination law for private housing in New York City (the law was passed), a voter registration drive throughout the South, and a campaign to bar blackface skits in northern schools—among other activities. While the NAACP now has begun to foster some career guidance programs for Negro youths, it still functions mainly as a pressure group rather than a social agency.

SEGREGATION SPUR

The power and importance of this militant group has grown with the national significance of the segregation issue. The NAACP's legal arm handled the original school cases that resulted in the Supreme Court's 1954 desegregation edict, and it has helped in nearly all the hundred-odd legal fights to implement that decision.

Thus, the current Southern State attacks on the association, if successful, could well shift the balance of power in the desegregation controversy. Many Deep South areas would make no moves to integrate without continued court pressure.

The varied judicial and legislative moves against the NAACP are designed to counter its legal, political, and other pressures for mixing the races. The southern attacks include bans on State employee membership in anti-segregation groups, laws requiring publication of membership lists, rigid registration rules for NAACP chapters, and laws limiting organized support of legal action against segregation.

In the Supreme Court this month NAACP attorneys argued against ouster of the association by Alabama. "If we lose this case, we're as good as half dead in the South," confides one official. Alabama is trying to keep the NAACP from operating within its borders; State courts have enjoined the association from doing business there because it didn't register as an out-of-State corporation and have levied a \$100,000 fine against the group for refusing to furnish membership lists.

DECISION IN RICHMOND

A group of Virginia measures that, in effect, limited NAACP activities was struck down last week, however, by a special Federal court in Richmond. The association has been fighting the laws for some time, and this decision represents a major victory. The voided Virginia laws required disclosure of membership lists and funds and registration with the State, along with a prohibition on barratry—stirring up litigation.

"Whatever the result of the Alabama case, it seems clear that the NAACP itself must face and fight a series of legal maneuvers designed to so occupy the time of our lawyers that they will be unable to push ahead on the desegregation front," declares Robert L. Carter, the association's general counsel, who now works full time on cases against the NAACP.

Threats and attacks against the association, of course, aren't new. Senator TALMADGE, Democrat, Georgia, has called the NAACP leaders "the most accomplished and professional race baiters in the world." And the moderate businessman-governor of North Carolina, Luther Hodges, calls it a "militant and selfish organization." Attorney General Eugene Cook, of Georgia, insists the association is dominated by "subversive elements"—a charge refuted by FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover.

But, as one temperate Southern observer puts it: "The undermining of the social tradition of racial segregation is, in the eyes of some Southerners, subversive. The fact this undermining has been done by legal means does not alter that judgment." Other Southern moderates question the use of legal pressure to achieve such a vast social change so quickly.

Even organizations which share most of the NAACP's goals generally shun its militant means. "We're trying to achieve the same end as the NAACP," says an official of the National Urban League, an interracial group, "but we prefer using the slower methods of education and community cooperation."

COOLING-OFF PERIOD

And since the violence of Little Rock, many friends of the NAACP from the North and South have been begging for a cooling-off period, to allow emotions to settle. But to an association founded in the abolitionist spirit, such strategy is unthinkable.

"Two-thirds of the times that phone rings, it is some friend begging or cajoling me to slow down," reports chief counsel Thurgood Marshall. "Why, if I slow down any more, I'll be running backwards."

Sitting in the association's national headquarters with his long legs crossed, Mr. Wilkins says: "If we let up now that we have the Supreme Court decision, we'd lose a lot of Negro membership, a lot of liberal northern support. Besides, we'd give southern extremists more of a green light."

From his fifth-floor office in the mid-Manhattan Willkie Memorial Building, Mr. Wilkins plans to keep his staff of 70 pushing. His goal for 1963: An end to State and local laws which the NAACP thinks discriminate against Negroes in voting, housing, jobs, transportation, and public accommodations.

This ambitious goal was set several years back by a membership convention, which in theory makes NAACP policy. Actually, the association is largely a staff headquarters operation, with Mr. Wilkins as boss and an elected board of directors monitoring major decisions. The 1,346 local chapters are more or less autonomous, but they must follow association goals and their success often depends on strong support from the national office for any major action.

PRESTIGE PEOPLE

Rank-and-file members comprise most of the present board along with a generous sprinkling of such "prestige people" as Walter

Reuther, United Auto Workers president; Eleanor Roosevelt, wife of the former President; and former Senator Herbert Lehman, of New York.

Such "name" board members naturally help the association raise money and political support. About 85 percent of the NAACP's \$700,000 annual operating budget comes from members' dues of \$2 to \$10, with the rest rounded out by contributions. Reserve funds of \$246,664 last year came from donations and bequests. In addition, the branches collect over \$400,000 in local dues, and donations to a separate national legal fund exceed \$300,000 annually.

Much of the NAACP's cash will go into political action during the next three years. With the passage of the new civil rights law, the association plans to stress voter registration in the South. "The realistic immediate goal" for 1960, according to Mr. Wilkins, is to bring total Negro registration in Dixie to 3 million voters—45 percent more than now are registered in the 11 Southern States.

VOTING RECORDS

The NAACP makes a practice of specifying which candidates it regards as "friends" or "foes" of the Negro, and indirectly suggesting that voters support the "friends" at the polls. The association distributes voting records of Congress, for example, on issues it believes are important.

"Of course, we can't afford to ignore many issues, even if they're not strictly racial ones, because our people are concerned with rent control, minimum wage laws, and public housing," says Mr. Wilkins.

No one knows just how much influence the NAACP exerts over Negro votes. Mr. Wilkins, of course, rates the association's influence pretty highly.

Speaking expansively of the NAACP's power, Clarence Mitchell, head of the organization's Washington lobby, argues: "The civil rights bill passed because we made it clear to Congress the only way to get back in office was to get a bill on the books." By 1960, he predicts, "We shall see colored Congressmen elected from the South."

This militant attitude on politics and other matters dates back to the association's founding—an event largely credited to a white Southern writer's indignation at a Northern race riot. Kentucky-born William English Walling wrote an angry article about a riot in Springfield, Ill. in 1903. After seeing the piece in a liberal weekly, the Independent, a New York social worker, Mary White Ovington, and a leader of immigrant groups, Henry Moskowitz, began forming the NAACP.

DOMINATED BY WHITES

From the beginning, the association was dominated by whites and assumed the militant philosophy of the abolitionist movement. In more recent years, both the control and membership have shifted mainly to Negroes. However, current president, New York Attorney Arthur B. Spingarn, like all his predecessors, is white.

Another change, according to Mr. Wilkins: "We've shifted from just a slugging outfit to one with a broader program." Few observers notice any letup of NAACP slugging, but the association has broadened its activities among young people and in the fields of labor and housing.

A program for career guidance, political education, and training for future NAACP leadership is conducted by the association's youth and college division. Some 34,000 members, ranging from 10 years to 25 years of age, belong to this division, including white students from all-white southern colleges as Duke University in Durham, N. C., and Vanderbilt in Nashville, Tenn.

"The white kids in the South take attitudes very different from their parents. That's a real hope for us," declares lanky Herbert L. Wright, the young head of the youth division. "Of course, not all these

white students come around all the way to our view," he adds.

CAREER GUIDANCE

The soft-speaking Mr. Wright talks enthusiastically of the career guidance programs the NAACP charters in many communities are running. "Most of our Negro kids have been brain washed because they see little incentive for doing well. We're trying to tell them of the many opportunities that are open so they won't be discouraged," he says.

A more controversial activity conducted by youths on the local level is sponsorship of economic boycotts to combat alleged discrimination. "We don't encourage boycotts, but they're free to use them," reports Mr. Wright.

Perhaps one of the hidden lines of NAACP strength lies in this youth division, many association officials indicate. At Harvard, the NAACP chapter claims to be the second largest student group on campus. And one of the largest chapters in the country (nearly 400 members) is at Oberlin College in Ohio, although most of the college's 2,100 students are white.

The housing department has gained new attention since New York City passed the first law outlawing discrimination in privately owned housing recently. "We don't try to lead Negroes by the hand. All we're trying to do is create a situation in which a man can live where he wants, according to his economic means," says Madison S. Jones, special assistant for housing.

HOUSING BOOKLET

A housing booklet the NAACP distributes to local leaders, however, suggests the association may lead some Negroes by the hand. The publication suggests that Negroes should apply to segregated public-housing projects, and adds: "Notify the national office of such action and results. We will carry on from there."

"We work on discrimination in housing through public support. Even if it's private housing, that segment often has support from the Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration loans," says Mr. Jones. Both these Government agencies, the Negro official concedes, decline to do much about NAACP discrimination charges in private housing.

"FHA has agreed to encourage developers who build integrated projects. And when there are repossessions, these buildings are sold without regard to race," claims Mr. Jones.

Whether this can be accomplished without disturbance depends a lot on the area—and the emotional climate at the time. Negroes moved into Levittown, Long Island, with few objections from white residents. But when, shortly after Little Rock, a Negro bought a home in Levittown, Pa.—and took over the existing VA mortgage—stones were thrown and protest demonstrations were staged. The Negro, William Myers, Jr., still lives in the big development, but so far no other Negro families have moved in.

SEGREGATION AGAIN

Mr. Jones says the association doesn't want "to flood areas with Negroes. That would be segregation again." To charges that Negroes in all-white communities tend to drive property values down, Mr. Jones counters:

"Naturally, values will depreciate if some Negroes move in and all the whites move out. This practice has been aided and abetted by some real-estate brokers." Most banks will not finance Negro homes in predominantly white communities, he adds.

Many proponents of racial integration in general question the NAACP's wisdom in trying to control or regulate the sale of private property.

The association's labor department, headed by a former united steelworkers official,

works toward removing racial barriers in industry and unions. NAACP Labor Secretary Herbert Hill approaches companies mainly through the nondiscrimination clause in Government contracts. With unions, he uses moral suasion and appeals to the top command.

"George Meany's own union, the plumbers, refuses to admit Negroes in most parts of the country, North as well as South. The right to belong to a building trades union is usually a necessary condition for employment as part of the collective bargaining agreement," declares Mr. Hill, one of the comparatively few non-Negroes on the NAACP staff.

In New York's Coliseum Building, uptown from the main association offices, are the new quarters of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.

STACK OF BOOKS

Counsel Thurgood Marshall, flanked by many of his weighty law books stacked on the waxed floor of his new office, explains the position of this legal arm. "We were set up in 1940 as a separate group. We became even more divorced from the association itself in 1956 after the United States Internal Revenue Department began studying our tax situation."

Though closely allied in goals, the legal group functions separately from the NAACP. Contributions to the legal body are tax deductible, unlike those which go to the association itself. The association is denied tax-exempt status because it seeks to influence legislation.

The legal fund functions as a legal aid society for Negroes. "We don't take a case unless the man comes to us," says Mr. Marshall, a hardy, graying Negro.

Laughing vigorously when a reporter asks what the legal arm's strategy and long-range battle plans are Mr. Marshall replies: "There's no master plan. Naturally the first segregation suits we filed were soft belly ones. We had to pick those that would get to the core of the problem. Now the cases come to us as they crop up locally. Ha. I wish sometimes we could hand-pick them. Perhaps it would be easier."

GIVE NEW POULTRY INSPECTION LAW A FAIR CHANCE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, last year we in the Congress took a momentous step for the protection of the consumers of this country by passing the Poultry Products Inspection Act to provide for compulsory inspection for sanitation and wholesomeness of all poultry moving in interstate commerce and also in certain designated major consuming areas in intrastate commerce.

The act which we passed, and which became Public Law 85-172 on August 28, 1957, was by no means the perfect measure in that it did not go as far as some of us would have preferred from the consumer standpoint. It was a compromise measure. Most legislation has to reflect compromise in order to reach enactment.

But on the whole it was a good bill, and, as I said, a remarkable forward step in view of the fact that we have never up to this time had any really effective machinery for preventing unwholesome poultry and poultry products from reaching the consumer. Now we do have a law—and on the whole a pretty good law—and it has teeth in it.

REGULATIONS APPEAR TO PROVIDE FOR EFFECTIVE ENFORCEMENT

Just this week, the regulations covering the administration of this act were distributed by the Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Marketing Service, after having been published in the Federal Register on February 5. I have not yet had a full opportunity to go over those regulations in the detailed manner I intend to, but a quick reading gives me the impression these regulations can provide generally effective enforcement.

It is my intention to follow up on a few items in the regulations to determine why certain things which had earlier appeared in drafts of the proposed regulations have not been included in the final set of rules. I might say in passing, however, that I am particularly pleased that the Department retained in the final regulations a requirement that kidneys must be removed for inspection of ready-to-cook poultry despite some opposition to this from sections of the processing industry. We have the impressive word of specialists in this field, as reported by the Department last November, that such a step is necessary to carry out the law's mandate that inspection must assure the wholesomeness of the poultry which bears the official stamp of approval.

The regulations which have now been issued take effect May 1, 1958, in establishments which are accepted on a voluntary basis into the program on or after that date. Mandatory inspection begins next January.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO WEAKEN NEW ACT

My purpose in discussing the Poultry Products Inspection Act today is not to take up the new regulations, but rather to point to the dangers inherent in legislative proposals which have already been made to weaken the new act even before it takes effect—to pass amendments desired by some segments of the processing industry which seem to want to have their cake and eat it too. Another way of putting it might be that they want to have their cake at the expense of the poultry-eating public and at the expense of the United States Treasury.

I am sure I do not have to tell the House in any detail at this point of my long association with the issues involved in this new law. I was one of the first sponsors in the Congress of an effective poultry inspection law, and have been working on the technical phases of such a law since early in 1954, having earlier taken up with the Food and Drug Administration the need for more effective controls in what had then been a neglected area of consumer protection.

The new law represents a compromise between the proposals of my original bill for a poultry inspection program directly and completely paralleling the meat inspection program for the red meats, and the desires of the poultry processing industry and the Department of Agriculture for a separate program related exclusively to poultry, and conducted within the Agricultural Marketing Service rather than in the Agricultural Research Service which has jurisdiction over meat inspection.

COMPROMISE BILL GENERALLY SATISFACTORY TO ALL GROUPS

One cannot praise too highly the effective work done by our colleague, Representative JOHN C. WATTS of Kentucky, chairman of the Poultry Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, in guiding the way to the generally satisfactory compromise which finally emerged. His contribution was truly an outstanding one and a demonstration of real statesmanship.

All of us felt, after this law was enacted last August, that it deserved a fair chance to show its effectiveness in meeting a serious consumer problem. I have felt, myself, that the Agricultural Marketing Service, which has jurisdiction over the program—and which primarily has the function of promoting the sale of poultry—should have every opportunity to show that it could do as well in this field of consumer protection as the Agricultural Research Service's Meat Inspection Division has done with the red meats.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am very much disturbed by legislative proposals introduced already this year to amend the new law—before it even takes effect on a permissive basis—to permit some poultry plants to process both inspected and uninspected poultry at the same time. True, these proposed amendments would apply only during the permissive period of the act's operation between May 1 and next January 1, when the mandatory program goes into effect. But we all know from past experience that weakening provisions put into a law presumably for temporary periods to meet real or supposed problems of transition often have a tendency to become permanent changes. And this possibility is one which I seriously fear.

ALLOWING INSPECTED AND NONINSPECTED PROCESSING IN SAME PLANTS

Under the proposed amendments which certain segments of the poultry processing industry are supporting, a plant could handle inspected poultry on one line and uninspected poultry on another; or they could process inspected poultry on one day and uninspected on another, on the same lines.

The purpose of such a change would be to enable some plants which cannot comply, or desire not to comply, immediately and fully with all of the requirements of the new law to begin May 1 to enjoy its benefits nevertheless, for this law provides significant benefits to the industry.

Let me explain the stakes involved:

Up to now, in order to obtain Federal inspection of poultry and a stamp or other official United States Government designation attesting to the purity and wholesomeness of their product under the long-standing voluntary inspection program, poultry processors have had to comply with certain sanitation requirements—as the new law also provides—and also have had to pay for the actual inspection work.

INSPECTION LABEL STIMULATES SALES TO CONSUMERS

Many poultry plants have chosen to do so, and have found it was good business. Obviously, it would have to be so,

since the budget shows that industry has been paying more than \$6 million a year for this Federal service under the existing voluntary-inspection program.

It is good business for the processors because consumers were being educated to seek out and to purchase that poultry in the stores which carried the United States label or stamp showing it was Federal inspected and approved. This has been particularly true after some of us in the Congress, along with consumer, public health, labor, and other groups have emphasized to the public the danger inherent in diseased poultry products heretofore sold in interstate commerce.

The public, for instance, has learned of epidemics of serious illnesses resulting in many tragic deaths among poultry workers processing diseased poultry in uninspected plants. I was able to report here in the House 4 years ago from evidence obtained from the Public Health Service and the Food and Drug Administration that at least 26 diseases of poultry could be communicated to humans.

Consequently, processing companies which recognized increased consumer demand for inspected and wholesome poultry could see the advantages of coming in under the voluntary program then in effect, and many did so, and paid for the inspection service. But others did not. They continued to process poultry without Federal inspection and without the stamp of approval, and were content to take their chances in the market place, meantime saving the cost of the inspection process.

NEW LAW PUTS INSPECTION COSTS ON UNITED STATES

Under the new law which we passed last year, however, we specified that the inspection should not only eventually be compulsory but that it should be provided to the processor without cost. Uncle Sam will hereafter pay for poultry inspection under the new law, just as the Federal Government has been paying for meat inspection in interstate commerce.

But if the United States Government—all of the taxpayers and all of the consumers—are going to pay for this inspection, I think they are entitled to full protection under the law. I think they are entitled to expect that firms which want to take advantage of the law's benefits—especially between May 1, 1958, and January 1, 1959, when plants can have the choice of coming in under the program or not—they have a right to expect, I repeat, that plants desiring to share in the benefits of the act during that period should comply completely with the act.

Beginning January 1 they will have no choice in the matter. They will have to comply, except under certain specified conditions. Even the bills which have been introduced to permit the processing of inspected and uninspected poultry in the same plants specify they are to be effective only until January 1, 1959.

PROCESSORS CAN STILL PAY FOR PARTIAL INSPECTION

But why permit that at all? The firms which cannot or will not comply fully with the new Poultry Products Inspection Act between May 1, 1958, and

January 1, 1959, but feel they should be allowed to enter the program on a transitional basis—half in and half out—could still qualify for the existing voluntary inspection program during that period just by paying the cost of the inspection work. And under the voluntary program which has been in effect for years, both inspected and uninspected poultry can be processed in the same plants. That has been one of the major faults—one of the major shortcomings—of the voluntary program, and one of the reasons the new compulsory program was enacted last year.

Why, then, Mr. Speaker, should we—the taxpayers—pay the cost of half-inspection in plants which are perfectly free to purchase that kind of partial inspection between May 1 and next January? If they want an inspection seal on their poultry, they can either comply with the full requirements of the new act, and thus obtain their inspection without charge, or they can pay for the kind of limited production inspection they seem to want.

There is no reason in the world why they should share the advantages of free inspection while at the same time delaying taking the necessary steps which other firms have had to take in order to comply with the new law.

STRENGTHENING AMENDMENTS WOULD BE IN ORDER

Mr. Speaker, if a serious effort is made to revise and weaken this law even before it takes effect, then there would be a duty upon those of us who sought an even stronger law to begin with to counter-attack with the strengthening amendments we were persuaded to forego last year in favor of compromise.

Strengthening amendments may eventually prove a necessity. But I had not intended to push for them at this time—at least until the present law was given a fair chance to show its effectiveness in operation. That was the attitude of all of us who took a direct hand in this legislation last year—to reach an effective compromise and give it a chance to operate. But I am afraid that if the attempt is now made to weaken the compromise, merely in order to provide a handout—and that's what it would be—to plants not ready or willing to comply with the law as written during the permissive period before it becomes mandatory, we are inviting a battle-royal which might well have the effect of destroying much of the good we have accomplished by compromise.

I know that is not the intention of those Members who have, in good faith, introduced bills to amend the act for the permissive period between May 1 and January 1. I am sure also it is not the intention either of those officials of the Department of Agriculture who have apparently not seen too much danger in these proposals.

CONFUSION FOR CONSUMERS

But I say this: The Department of Agriculture will have all it can handle between now and May 1 in gearing up its program and getting the qualified people needed to administer the law in just those plants which are now fully able and fully willing to comply with all

of the provisions of the new law. There is a shortage of qualified people for inspection work. Many will have to be trained. This condition will continue probably right up to January 1 when the mandatory program goes into effect. It sounds silly to open up the program, during this permissive period, to plants wanting only part-time service when it will be so difficult to take care of those needing and entitled to full-time service.

There is a very important aspect of this problem as it affects the consumer. If the same plant can distribute poultry under the same brand name and with the same wrappers whether the poultry is inspected or uninspected—the only difference being the inspection seal on part of their output—the consumer can be very easily confused or misled. If one day she buys a brand of poultry which she notices bears the inspected seal, she will be inclined to identify the brand name as being always on inspected poultry.

I would hate to think that a housewife seeking inspected poultry could not depend on a particular brand from day to day but would perhaps have to go behind the butcher's counter each time or into the storage room to study the fine print on the container in which it was shipped to be sure she was getting inspected poultry. Yet I foresee that happening if firms can process both inspected and uninspected poultry in the same plants and ship them out in similar containers or wrappers, some shipments bearing the inspection seal and some not.

SOLUTION FOR SMALL PLANTS SEEKING TO COMPLY

Mr. Speaker, if the operation of the new law beginning May 1 on a permissive basis and January 1 on a mandatory basis provides problems for firms actively seeking to comply, but perhaps running into certain difficulties, let us see what we can do to help them in some way other than by weakening the law itself. Why can we not encourage Small Business Administration loans to such firms to help them get fully in compliance? There are many things we can do to help them comply by January 1, when compliance is mandatory in any event. If the individual case is a worthy one and it is only a question of funds or equipment, let us encourage them to obtain loans from the variety of sources now available.

But let us not, Mr. Speaker, shove onto Uncle Sam the cost of inspecting part of a firm's output while that firm is not ready to have all of its output inspected. Let us not shove onto the consumer the necessity to search out the shipping containers to know from day to day what part of a shipment is inspected. And let us not put the seal of the United States Government approval on products coming from plants where poultry workers work part of the time on certified wholesome products and part of the time on uninspected products which could perhaps infect them with the kind of illnesses we are trying to stamp out under the new law.

If we are going to have a wholesome poultry products law in operation, with

the Federal Government paying the cost of inspection, let us make sure all of the poultry from an inspected plant—and I mean all of it—is wholesome and safe under the terms of that law; that is, that none of it is half safe.

RIGHT TO BENEFITS OF ACT MUST BE EARNED

I hope the proponents of these proposed changes in the law will have the patience to wait with the rest of us to see how the law actually operates beginning May 1 before seeking premature changes or precipitating the kind of battle which might delay further the time when the marginal plants might be able to qualify and can be brought in under the program.

Our first obligation has to be to the consumer. Next, our obligation should be to those plants which have brought their operations into compliance—or will very shortly—including firms which over the years have spent many thousands of dollars to help build the prestige of the United States seal of approval on poultry. Inspection service during the period between May 1, 1958, and January 1, 1959, will be a valuable asset for those firms which comply. All firms which wish to benefit from this opportunity should certainly be willing to do what is required under the reasonable provisions of the new law.

A GRANDIOSE FOREIGN AID SALES PITCH

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hold here in my hand a copy of the printed program for a most unusual function to be held in Washington on February 25. This program is titled "National Conference on the Foreign Aspects of United States National Security." The Associated Press, however, has accurately labeled the affair for what it actually is—a grandiose foreign aid sales pitch. I quote from an AP report as published by the Washington Post and Times Herald for Thursday, February 6:

President Eisenhower will make a speech February 25 in behalf of the administration's proposed \$4 billion foreign-aid program. He will address the concluding session of a foreign-aid conference here to be attended by representatives of about 300 organizations.

This program in the Nation's Capital, which will constitute perhaps the largest and most distinguished single lobbying effort ever undertaken in an attempt to sell the American people and the Congress on any matter at all, will mark the grand opening of Mr. Eisenhower's all-out move to whip up support for his administration's vast and, in many instances, wasteful and basically ineffective foreign spending policy.

The list of speakers for this mammoth lobbying job is a most impressive one, but certainly an amazing one. With the head of the Motion Picture Association of America, Mr. Eric Johnston, as the program chief, the foreign-aid lobby is featuring not only President Eisenhower, but former President Truman; not only

Secretary of State Dulles, but former Secretary Dean Acheson; not only Vice President Nixon, but former presidential candidate Adlai Stevenson—all on the same day's printed program, of which I hold a copy in my hand.

Three distinguished clergymen, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—the Reverend Edwin T. Dahlberg, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, and Rabbi Theodore L. Adams—have also been brought into the sales campaign. So have numerous other top officials in the Government, including the Secretary of Defense and the Assistant Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Under Secretary of State, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Director of the International Cooperation Administration, and the manager of the foreign-aid program development loan fund, as well as others. And there will be hundreds, possibly many hundreds, of representatives of some 300 organizations from all parts of our Nation, whipping up more support for foreign aid, although doubtless a great majority of them are without basic facts as to what the program has accomplished or is likely to accomplish.

This will indeed be a lobbying lineup of such proportions that I have never before encountered during my 11 years in the Congress. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the people involved are great and good and patriotic Americans—but going all the way now in a cleverly conceived attempt to sell the people and the Congress another bill of goods for foreign aid.

While I surely do not doubt the sincerity of purpose of the distinguished leaders who will be participating in this foreign-aid promotion, the very fact that such a pressure meeting is being arranged at all raises some relevant questions: Do these people consider the foreign-aid program of such dubious value as to require this sort of unheard-of salesmanship in order to keep it alive? Do they regard the American people as so ignorant as to have been unable to determine basic facts about the program through a period of 10 years? Is the intelligence or the judgment of the Members of Congress believed so doubtful that this distinguished group must converge on Washington with this great lobbying effort in order to set us straight?

I am seriously concerned that the results of this foreign-aid promotion may most likely be a public disservice, and not a service—no matter the probable worthy motives and intent of many of the participants. For, among other doubts, I respectfully wonder just how well informed some of these people really are concerning the hard facts of foreign aid, and not merely with the hopes and ideals and broad generalities of the program.

Will these foreign-aid lobbyists, in good conscience, try to convince the American people and the Congress that the program is assuring our safety through strength? Will they contend, seriously, that the program is accomplishing a significant role in building a genuine peace? Will they claim, with foundation of fact, that foreign aid has been a major instrument in moving American and free world policy forward—if, in truth, it has really moved forward at all?

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the public interest could be better served if these super salesmen for foreign aid were to concentrate on learning more of the real facts of the program—as many Members of the Congress, and especially a majority of the Members handling the money bill for foreign aid, including myself, have earnestly endeavored to do—and would then take that information to the people. If such a course were followed, this Nation's foreign spending program would assuredly be gradually but consistently reduced. And America would be the better, the stronger, because of such a condition coming about.

But, unfortunately, there has probably never been devised in our Nation a more actively functioning propaganda machine than the one which is operated by the advocates of free-spending foreign aid, with powerful pressure groups pushing the program, seeking spending far in excess of the needs justifiable by the facts. Large numbers of our highest paid bureaucrats and their subordinates are working without letup to convince the American people and the Members of Congress that the foreign-aid program is indispensable, and that ever more funds are required to support it. Further, representatives of numerous foreign nations are exerting extreme efforts to influence larger contributions for their particular countries. And, disappointing as it certainly is, many of our Nation's big business firms—manufacturers, bankers, shippers, brokers, and others—with profitable contracts through the program, are strong advocates of everlasting, bigger spending foreign aid.

A favorite foreign-aid gambit during the past several years has been the appointment of committees and commissions. There were, for example, the Gray Commission, Eric Johnston's committee, Nelson Rockefeller's group, the Fairless Commission, and others instructed to report on foreign aid.

It has become obvious that these commissions are taken in hand and into camp by the bureaucrats. It amounts to about this: These businessmen are brainwashed and sent around the world. When they get to the foreign countries, they are assailed by our other bureaucrats abroad, who are getting automobiles, homes, servants, and all manner of luxuries, such as the vast majority of them, if actually any of them, never enjoyed before. Some of these bureaucrats are Socialists and some of them are worse. They have a common talent, though, and that is being able to hoodwink so-called investigating committees before, during, and after these much-heralded tours.

With this big foreign-aid snow job falling here on February 25, it is well that not only the visiting organization representatives should be cautioned, and the American people as a whole, but also Members of the Congress. Talk, such as the foreign-aid lobby has been dispensing, and is now about to increase, concerning dedication to common ideals, free-world unity, and similar remarks, is pleasing to hear; but it is not so potent as facts.

There are 87 nations in the world; and so great has been the propaganda

and pressure, now being stepped up far beyond even past proportions, for a more widespread, complex and confusing program of foreign aid on the part of the United States, there are now in the program, past and present, funds for 70 members of the world of nations. Expressed another way, with the United States as the donor, only 16 nations in all the world are not receiving, or have not received, some type of aid under the program. And the total of aid which the United States has given since the end of World War II is \$67 billion—give or take a few billion, according to the statistics used.

Remember, this program is built from the bottom up, not from the top down. Under the mode of operation, the majority of the nations receiving this aid will have military groups plugging for more funds. And, in the same nations, there are civilian groups handling the economic and technical aid programs, and they are also constantly beating the drums for increases for the particular nation in which they are stationed. The heads of these missions, both military and civilian, have created little empires of their own, thousands of miles from home. If they can in any manner avoid it, they have no intention of losing this fancy living and prestige.

Furthermore, and the facts are of record, vast sums of this money have been going to Communist governments, to dictatorships, and to other nations we cannot rely upon as friends. And even among the friendly nations which have been given huge amounts of American taxpayers' aid, the actual value of the program in the defense of this Nation—which after all is the major function of our Government—is extremely doubtful, to say the most for it.

But, Mr. Speaker, even if the program were accomplishing the goals and fulfilling the purposes its proponents claim for it, I still could not give validity to the current requests and claims. Secretary Dulles himself less than a year ago was conceding that this year's and future annual expenditures for the foreign aid program should be smaller than in previous years. I should like to quote here from an exchange with Mr. Dulles to that effect, when he appeared before our Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee.

I commented:

The policy is well established. There have been many years' experience with the program, and the large annual expenditures are in the past. Would you agree that this statement is correct?

Secretary Dulles replied:

Yes; I think that is correct. I do not have the figures in front of me, but I think that is the trend of the figures.

Also, I wish to present excerpts from an exchange in the same period of hearings, during last April, May, June, and July, with Mr. Hollister, then the ICA Administrator, to the effect that more funds than needed were appropriated the previous year, and that no damage whatsoever resulted to the program from the reduction in the appropriation. Nevertheless, I might note that the same sort of hue and cry had been sounded

then as was heard last year and is now being renewed, but even more vigorously than before.

Here are the excerpts:

Mr. PASSMAN. Will you agree with me that we actually appropriated too much money for these agencies last year?

Mr. HOLLISTER. More than they were able to obligate.

Mr. PASSMAN. More than you were able to obligate?

Mr. HOLLISTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is the record clear that we did not damage the program by reducing the appropriation last year?

Mr. HOLLISTER. The record speaks for itself.

Mr. PASSMAN. I shall accept that as an affirmative answer.

Yet, on Tuesday, February 25, 12 days from today, the first-team foreign-aid lobby swings into full action here in Washington with Mr. Dulles as the opening speaker. Will he then repudiate his testimony of less than a year ago?

The assertions of these lobbyists, or others, notwithstanding, I urgently suggest that—with the peace and security of this Nation as the matter for prime concern on the part of every person in public life, both in and out of government—the facts as they are, with the needs of the program, and not bureaucratic wishes, should continue to serve as the guide for the conclusions reached by the Members of the Congress and the Nation's citizens.

Unfortunately—and no amount of idealistic lobbying or political coverup or seeking for advantage can prove it differently—our foreign-aid program has to a large extent degenerated into a miserable mess in which, for example, the United States is paying glorified blackmail to unfriendly regimes in many countries, to deter them from running off to Russia for help. But in most instances Russian help is limited to promises. It has not been successfully refuted what Russia's Lenin taught, loosely translated, "Give the United States sufficient time and it will spend itself into bankruptcy."

Furthermore, we keep on giving great sums of United States taxpayers' money to governments already in the Communist orbit—wishing hoping that someday they will somehow free themselves from the clutches of the dictators in the Kremlin. And to practically all of the governments, friendly and unfriendly, huge sums of the foreign aid money from free-enterprise America are given, and accepted and used, for the purpose of socializing their industry and commerce and agriculture.

During an inspection of foreign aid program operations last year I observed on the spot in many nations the evidences and results of wasteful spending, lack of cooperation and coordination, and actually found many of the people in charge with scant knowledge of the real purposes of their missions.

I studied the program in France and Italy, in Greece and Turkey, in Lebanon and Pakistan, in Thailand, and in other nations.

In Thailand, a 200-mile asphalt road was undertaken as a \$6.5 million demonstration of United States efficiency in peaceful pursuits. After 2½ years, the

cost has skyrocketed to \$18 million for the first 100 miles.

About \$3 billion of our money has been used by the recipients to reduce their national debts—while our own debt spirals up to disastrous proportions. In fact, so great has been our spending that our own public debt now exceeds the consolidated public debts of all other nations of the world by \$68 billion.

I wish to quote here from a statement of the former Peruvian Ambassador to Washington, Pedro Beltran, for some years owner of *La Prensa*, a great newspaper in his country, who said:

If a nation relies on handouts to live, its future is doomed. As time goes on, it finds it harder and harder to get on its feet and forge its own future. It ends by making no effort to develop its own resources or be self-supporting. As long as such a state of affairs prevails, such a country will never come of age, but will continue to be dependent on others without prospects for the future.

It should be realized that private capital can achieve what no public treasury can do. When confidence has been established, the amount of private capital that may flow into a country is practically unlimited. Private investors will compete with one another and seek out the opportunities. But government money cannot do this, since risk venture is beyond its province. Private capital will flow if the investor feels that he can operate in a free economy.

Mr. Speaker, I returned from my 5-week around-the-world investigations last year more firmly convinced than I had ever been that we must put some sense into the foreign-aid program, by tapering off the present rate of spending and halting further poorly founded commitments. I was literally sickened by much of what I saw for myself, and learned otherwise.

I visited one nation where the strong man of the country, which we are substantially subsidizing, is suspected of being a full-fledged partner in an illegal opium operation. This same strong man owns some 30 different businesses, and practically everything purchased for his government, military, and other purchases, must be requisitioned through one of his companies.

Has there been successful refutation that Lebanon, with a relatively healthy economy, is being subsidized with United States aid merely to guard against offense being taken by the Lebanese Government because of aid being given to some of the other countries in the area?

Or that Oman—or Muscat—refused a United States offer of \$2 million in aid because this was not as much as had been given to another country in the vicinity?

Or, Mr. Speaker, have the reports of other giveaways such as these been successfully refuted?

Shiploads of foreign-aid farm tractors and other machinery rusting and falling apart on the docks in certain Middle Eastern countries?

The providing of public baths for camel drivers?

Free airplane transportation for thousands of Arabs to visit Mecca, their religious shrine?

Five million dollars in subsidies for wealthy Iranians to complete college?

A supply depot in Laos, with a total population of about a million and a half, crammed with drugs and other expensive medical material in sufficient quantities to care for much of the whole of Southeast Asia?

And, lest I forget, dress suits for Grecian undertakers?

These are, of course, a few of the extreme examples reported. But they are examples of a type which are not likely to be mentioned by the foreign-aid lobbyists here on February 25—or, for that matter, at other times, either.

Nor are these reports, of which I do not know of successful refutation:

The sending of "Satchmo" Armstrong and "Dizzy" Gillespie and their bands as ambassadors of American culture to foreign lands, at thousands of dollars weekly in costs.

The giving of Afghanistan, where the populace rides camels and the main requisite is to teach the people how to read and write, of \$14.5 million to start 5 airports and provide electronic equipment for another.

The granting to India in 1954 of \$1.5 million of prefabricated steel to erect grain silos and warehouses, with most of the material sitting unused last fall. And then, 2 years later, approving an additional \$4 million for several hundred more warehouses, notwithstanding the fact that nothing had been done about using the materials already sent.

Can these statements be successfully refuted?

This policy of government-to-government handouts is losing friends for the United States. There has been tremendous growth over the last few years in geographical area and number of Communist countries, millions of square miles added to their territory, with hundreds of millions of people. There has also been a similar growth over the same period of the number of so-called uncommitted or neutral countries.

How can we make friends by such measures as we have been following? India gets mad because we give grants to Pakistan. Pakistan gets mad because we give grants to India. Others get mad because we give grants to either one or both of them. Still others get mad because we do not give them big enough grants. Pakistan and Iraq were mad because we offered Egypt the Aswan Dam, which never should have been offered in the first place. Others quite frankly prefer the Soviet or Chinese Communist loans to our gifts. They are opposed to us; they vote against us in the United Nations, while nationalizing everything in their countries and creating socialistic states.

But, Mr. Speaker, aside from these and countless other examples of record—of poor judgment and waste and inefficiency on the part of administrators of the foreign-aid program and possible trickery and bribery and fraud on the part of some of the recipients, have the constructive features of foreign aid been worth the staggering cost to this Nation of more than \$67 billion since the end of World War II? Has the program served significantly to strengthen the peace and security of the United States and the free world?

To the open-minded person who will read the RECORD well, the answers are: They have not. Is it not true that the United States has permitted this complex, confusing, worldwide spending program to get completely out from under control?

Russian Communist world influence has spread and strengthened, while American prestige throughout the world has weakened—and we, not the Communists, have been the practitioners of the prolific and terrific worldwide spending.

No matter that the program has proved to be the most expensive folly in which this country has ever engaged, the foreign-aid lobbyists boldly continue to seek more American dollars as the cure for the ills—notwithstanding the abundance of the facts to the contrary.

We have been putting foreign aid to the test—with more than \$67 billion spent in 70 of the other 86 nations of the world, since the end of World War II—and it has woefully fallen short of securing the desired results. But it has not failed to entangle this Nation with many questionable commitments in 70 other countries.

Mr. Speaker, we have been appropriating too much, and not too little, for the program, year after year.

The distinguished foreign-aid lobbyists will claim differently here on February 25. But their saying otherwise will not make it so. The facts are, after all, more potent than even their tremendous sales campaign—irrespective of how illustrious the identities of the public lobbyists, and no matter how much White House or ICA staff and funds and office space and stamps and stationery and telephone calls and telegrams and other expense items, paid for by the overburdened taxpayer, may be employed to promote the effort. It is unlikely that any scheme they may dream up for spending more and more of the people's money will have any more merit than those of the past.

Doubtless we will continue to have a foreign-aid program for many years. But it should be a more sensible foreign-aid program, and certainly not one costing billions of dollars for questionable friends around the globe.

ARSENALS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time in order to talk about arsenals all over the United States and the Watertown Arsenal in particular. But before I begin those remarks I would like to speak for 5 minutes and to insert in the RECORD a letter from Mr. William F. Sullivan of the Northern Textile Association, addressed to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, and have this carried at this point in the RECORD under a separate heading. The great velveteen industry in the United States should be saved, Mr. Speaker.

As the Speaker may remember, a year ago we thought we had saved by voluntary Japanese agreement the velveteen industry and certain other cotton industries from too much Japanese competition. But the Japanese have not, we find, according to the Census Bureau figures, lived up to their agreement, and in Lowell, Mass., if relief is not given by the Japanese and by the United States, our great Merrimack mills will close their doors. It is the oldest large cotton textile manufacturing plant in the United States. It has a great history of accomplishment with wonderful workers. It would be a tragedy too awful to think of if this administration and everybody in the Congress does not put his or her shoulder to the wheel and save that great textile industry. The Japanese should be told that they must do their part in helping us or they will not fare well. That is not a threat, Mr. Speaker; it is just trying to show the Japanese that they had much better help us if they expect help from us. I feel sure they will see the justice in that. We have a right to keep our industries in operation.

We must not allow any other country to trample on our industry. The letter from Mr. Sullivan's unit, with figures from the Census Bureau, is as follows:

FEBRUARY 11, 1958.

The Honorable SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY WEEKS: At our meeting last week I stated that the Japanese had violated the velveteen quota. Mr. Kearns indicated that his information was to the contrary.

VELVETEENS

The Japanese velveteen quota was set at 2.5 million yards of exports. Between January 1 and November 30, 1957, the Japanese actually landed in this country 3,209,902 square yards.

Even if we deduct the 4,765 yards of Japanese velveteens landed in January 1957 on the theory that this yardage was exported in December 1956, we find that the Japanese must have exported to this country in excess of 3.2 million yards in 11 months of 1957. When the December 1957 figures are available we will know the full extent of this violation. Some of the 3.2 million yards landed in this country were warehoused, but at the same time the Japanese withdrew during the course of the year velveteens which had already been put in the warehouses. The net result was that 3,030,137 square yards were actually put on the American market during 1957. This information has been supplied to us by the Bureau of the Census, Report No. FT5019. I enclose a more detailed breakdown of the velveteen imports from Japan and from Italy.

You will recall that the Japanese also violated their velveteen commitment in 1956, having brought in more than 1 million yards in excess of their 5-million-yard quota.

HANDKERCHIEFS

Our information also indicates a violation of the handkerchief quota by the Japanese.

The quota was 1,200,000 dozen. Imports for consumption through November 1957 amounted to 1,529,343 dozen.

We do not have the breakdown on handkerchiefs.

GINGHAMS

There is also a possibility of a violation of the 35 million square yard quota of gingham; 39,333,154 square yards of Japanese

ginghams and related fabrics (commodity No. 3062) were imported during the first 11 months of 1957.

From the Bureau of Census data we are not able to separate gingham from related fabrics. Therefore, we are unable to prove, on the basis of present information, that there is a violation, as we can in the case of velveteens where accurate information is available.

If we were to deduct from the 1957 Japanese velveteen quota the amounts by which the Japanese exceeded their 1956 and 1957 commitments, they would not be entitled to bring in any velveteens during 1958. As you know, the Merrimack Manufacturing Co. in Lowell, the largest maker of velveteens, is shut down.

We would greatly appreciate your personal attention in connection with this matter, and particularly in view of the discussions which I understand are being currently held with the Japanese on cotton goods imports.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. SULLIVAN.

United States imports of velveteens from Japan, November 1957

[Square yards]

	Landed and not warehoused (col. 1)	Landed and warehoused (col. 2)	Withdrawn from warehouse (col. 3)
1957—November.....	34,769	99,938	38,357
January–November..	2,522,076	687,826	508,061

	Total placed on market (cols. 1 and 3)	Total landed (cols. 1 and 2)
1957—November.....	73,126	134,707
January–November..	3,030,137	3,209,902

ESTIMATE OF MINIMUM QUANTITY IN WAREHOUSES

	Square yards
1956—Oct. 31.....	1,103,419
Nov. 30.....	799,064
Dec. 31.....	244,564
1957—Jan. 31.....	196,380
Feb. 28.....	190,319
Mar. 31.....	155,147
Apr. 30.....	150,890
May 31.....	146,335
June 30.....	156,637
July 31.....	197,954
Aug. 31.....	282,493
Sept. 30.....	259,463
Oct. 31.....	365,698
Nov. 30.....	427,279

Source: Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce, Northern Textile Association, Jan. 27, 1958.

United States imports of velveteens from Italy, November 1957

[Square yards]

	Landed and not warehoused (col. 1)	Landed and warehoused (col. 2)	Withdrawn from warehouse (col. 3)
1957—November.....	42,100	7,826	22,938
January–November..	684,897	332,961	270,366

	Total placed on market (cols. 1 and 3)	Total landed (cols. 1 and 2)
1957—November.....	65,038	49,926
January–November..	955,263	1,017,858

Source: Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce, Northern Textile Association, Jan. 27, 1958.

Mr. Speaker, on Saturday the 8th of February I attended, as did the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL], who represents the adjoining district to mine, a very fine dinner given by Arsenal Post No. 5 of the Federal Employees Veterans Association at Watertown. The Speaker may remember that about a year ago the Watertown Arsenal was saved and given work. The former Speaker of the House [Mr. MARTIN] and the majority floor leader [Mr. McCORMACK] and the entire Massachusetts delegation join me in hoping to save work for our great arsenal. I have here a speech given at that dinner on last Saturday by Colonel Hurst. That great Watertown Arsenal is 135 years old; the oldest arsenal, I understand, in the entire United States.

As you all remember, the great Jupiter missile, called the Explorer, which is today winging its way all over the world, is proof of what this great ordnance plant at Huntsville, Ala., under General Medaris has accomplished. The Watertown Arsenal and other arsenals have made magnificent contributions toward the building of that very fine missile.

Colonel Hurst said:

TALK BY COL. R. M. HURST, COMMANDER OF WATERTOWN ARSENAL, AT A DINNER MEETING OF WATERTOWN ARSENAL, POST NO. 5, FEVA, ON FEBRUARY 8, 1958

As many of you know, I recently returned from a visit to the Army Ballistic Missile Agency at Huntsville, Ala. Certain contacts which I had during this visit have prompted a desire to comment briefly this evening on a subject which has been a topic of discussion with members of my staff on frequent occasions and with a greater portion of the arsenal work force on more limited occasions.

You have read much in the press about the team of German scientists at ABMA. I have seen them in action. They are an extremely capable, sincere, hard-working group whose accomplishments under the technical direction of Dr. von Braun and under the general guidance and supervision of an outstanding ordnance officer, Maj. Gen. J. B. Medaris, are well known to you. This team has demonstrated a unanimity of purpose, a level of competence, and a persistence which have paid off in an outstanding achievement—the launching of our first satellite.

We at Watertown Arsenal also have a team—not so highly specialized as the ABMA team, but possessing an equal measure of competence, of sincerity, of purpose, of persistence, and of determination. This team is comprised of some 2,600 scientists, engineers, technicians, craftsmen, and administrative personnel included in our work force. We have at Watertown Arsenal a fully integrated capability, embracing the fields of basic and applied research; design and development engineering; product, maintenance, and process engineering; and manufacturing. This is not a newborn capability, but one based on almost a century and a half of steady development, and one which reflects the individual capabilities of dedicated employees with 2, 3, and 4 decades of contribution to the defense of our country.

In the ordnance materials research office and the Watertown Arsenal laboratories we have almost 350 scientists, engineers, and technicians whose work in materials and related research is of the highest quality and

enjoys national and international recognition. These laboratories compare favorably with those of any of our larger corporations.

In the engineering field we have individuals with years and years of experience in designing and developing those munitions vital to our defense, and in setting them up for limited production in the arsenal or for volume production in the plants of our great industrial enterprises.

In Rodman Laboratory we have engineers, technicians, and craftsmen constantly exploring techniques of manufacturing so that we can have the most advanced methods available, not only for our own purposes, but for the use of industry as well. For example, in fields such as the application of ceramics to machine tools and in the use of investment casting techniques, we are in the forefront. In the February issue of Foundry appears an outstanding article on investment casting written by two of our employees.

Then we have out in our shops hundreds and hundreds of craftsmen who can convert the ideas of scientists and the designs of engineers into the hard goods required by our combat forces in the defense of our country. These craftsmen have levels of skill which permit them to hold their own with their fellow craftsmen in industry any place, bar none. They are turning out of our shops major pieces of work which are a challenge to anyone to produce.

We also have several hundred employees who play a supporting role—accountants, clerks, typists, guards, maintenance men, warehousemen, and many others—all of them playing important parts in facilitating the accomplishment of our organizational objectives. Not only must there be a production of goods and services of high quality, in proper quantity, and at the proper time, but it must be of proper cost as well. Of particular significance in holding our costs down to levels that are equal to or below those of others performing similar work within or without Government circles is the close control exercised by our people within the support areas.

Of course, our arsenal team is not operating alone. It is part of an ordnance family which is mutually supporting, and which for many decades has been participating as a member of an ordnance-industry-science team in producing the ordnance munitions which our country requires. The arsenal is also part of an industrial community of this New England area, and as such enjoys the wholehearted, active, and aggressive support of Congressional representatives such as your distinguished guests, Mrs. Rogers and Mr. O'Neill; of civic leaders such as your national commander, Mr. Kenneth Lyons; and of representatives of the press such as Mr. Tom Winship of the Boston Globe.

Our team may have its ups and downs, but it will continue in the future, as in the past, to make its very significant contributions to the defense of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times on the floor of the extreme importance of keeping our arsenals open. Our country has reason to be very proud of the accomplishments of those great arsenals and we must keep them if we are to be thoroughly protected in this day of the missiles, this day of danger from without. We cannot scrap or weaken our arsenals.

As the Army's ballistic missiles roar into space from the launching sites at Cape Canaveral and White Sands Proving Ground, their progress is watched with particular interest by Army ordnance scientists, engineers and craftsmen within the Army arsenal system.

The successful development of each of the Army's missiles and rockets is the result of highly integrated and coordinated teamwork among American scientific and industrial concerns and the Army's arsenals.

Army arsenals have met the challenge of every national emergency. The successful launching of the Jupiter C rocket carrying the Explorer satellite is further evidence that Army arsenals are meeting the challenges of the new technological age.

While Army arsenals for generations have developed fine weapons, they have regeared their organization and capabilities to the era of atomics, electronics, and supersonic rockets and missiles.

While the Army Ballistic Missile Agency, Huntsville, Ala., has the weapon system responsibility for developing the Jupiter, nonprofit research organizations, American industry and other Army arsenals have contributed directly to the outstanding success of this program. Likewise, Army arsenals have assisted Redstone Arsenal in developing and fielding other weapons in the Army's versatile family of guided missiles and rockets.

Specific areas of responsibility and contributions by ordnance installations follow:

Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala., is responsible for the development, procurement, production, industrial engineering and mobilization, maintenance and repair parts supply and stock control of guided missiles and rockets.

Army Ballistic Missile Agency, Huntsville, Ala., was established in February 1956 and assigned the full responsibility for the Redstone and Jupiter Missiles program. It also has responsibility for the new Pershing missile.

Industrial engineering and manufacture of solid propellants for rockets, jets and guided missiles, fuses and warheads for rockets and guided missiles are done by Picatinny Arsenal, Dover, N. J.

Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa., is responsible for the development and manufacture of mechanical arming mechanisms for guided missiles and rockets. Diamond Ordnance Fuze Laboratory, Washington, D. C., also has responsibility for the development and manufacture of fuses and arming mechanism for rockets and guided missiles.

Special purpose vehicles for launchers, rockets and guided missiles are developed at the Ordnance Tank Automotive Command, Detroit, Mich.

Basic research in the field of liquid and solid propellants and rocket composition principals are carried on at the Office of Ordnance Research, Durham, N. C.

Contributions by Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass., in the guided missile and rocket field include research, development and engineering in the fabrication of launcher prototypes, models, experimental equipment and related equipment.

Mr. Speaker, relative to the missile work at Watertown, on the 8th of February, at Watertown Arsenal, I made the following statement:

As the Army's ballistic missiles roar into space from the launching sites at Cape Canaveral, their progress is watched with particular interest by a group of New England scientists, engineers, and craftsmen. These are the people of Watertown Arsenal, located within the metropolitan Boston area in the town of Watertown, Mass. This Army Ordnance Corps arsenal is currently engaged in several activities relating to the missile program. For several years it has been making significant contributions to the Army Ballistic Missile Agency and to Redstone Arsenal, at Huntsville, Ala., in support of their programs. These contributions are in the field of research, development and engineering, and in the manufacture of launcher prototypes, models, experimental equipment, fixtures, and related equipment.

For almost a century and a half, Watertown Arsenal has been making important contributions to the growth and development of our country. For over 130 years it has operated laboratories which have performed pioneering research in the field of ferrous metallurgy, and more recently this program has been expanded to include titanium and other transitional metals, and to give special attention to high temperature, high strength alloy steels. Its development and engineering staffs have recorded outstanding achievements recently in the fulfillment of system responsibilities for the designing, development, and manufacture of the 280 millimeter atomic cannon and the 75 millimeter Skysweeper. The arsenal's investigation into methods for improvement of manufacturing techniques has resulted in outstanding advancement in the application of ceramic materials to cutting metals, in the use of investment castings, in the cold forming of materials by swaging, and in other processes as well.

Recent years have seen a marked shifting of the attention of arsenal personnel from the conventional heavy artillery and anti-aircraft weapons to the newer devices of modern warfare. Ballistic missiles and rockets are commanding ever-increasing amounts of attention.

The Watertown Arsenal Laboratories are currently engaged in a number of studies relating to research and development in the missile field. Just recently an extensive survey of special thermal properties of several commercial plastics was completed, these particular materials having unusual and versatile characteristics of great current interest in the missile program because of their extreme chemical inertness to fuels, lubricants, and acids, as well as their toughness and resiliency over a wide range of temperatures. Currently, under investigation is the design of the bulkhead of one of the missiles. This bulkhead or partition divides the primary structural components of the midsection of the missile, and separates the liquid oxygen from the fuel. If this bulkhead is not properly designed, it can rupture and thus lead to possible premature self-destruction of the missile. It is the purpose of the investigation to provide principles and data which will lead to improvement of the design.

The laboratories are also engaged in mathematical studies for the purpose of determining stress conditions in the skin or outer covering of missiles. These studies, likewise, will lead to improved design and also provide safeguards against buckling failures. Still other studies are concerned with the finding of alternate structural materials which may be substituted for critical metals and alloys so that these may be conserved during possible periods of emergency.

Engineers at Watertown Arsenal have provided substantial assistance to their associates at the Army Ballistic Missile Agency in the development and improvement of launching tables for both the Redstone and Jupiter missiles. They have also recently completed the design and development of a lightweight launcher for the Honest John rocket. All of these launchers require the most careful selection of materials and the precise determination of design characteristics so that they will hold up under the conditions of stress and of temperature which are imposed upon them.

Watertown Arsenal has the heavy machine tools and craftsmanship which are required to convert the designs of the engineers into "hardware". This close support which the shops provide for the research and development program, provides for the delivery of new items of materiel at the earliest possible time. The arsenal's craftsmen are highly skilled in their respective trades, and bring to the missile program decades of experience in the casting, machining, fabrication, and assembly of heavy structures.

These skills and facilities have permitted the arsenal to move rapidly into the essential production of heavy assemblies which are a part of or related to modern munitions. Included among such items, manufactured at Watertown Arsenal, are the launchers for the Redstone and Jupiter missiles, and the transportable launcher for the Honest John rocket. Also included are such things as missile assembly fixtures, nose cones, and heavy wind tunnel components. In a field related to the missile program is the manufacture and assembly of antenna systems for heavy radar equipment.

The craftsmanship at Watertown Arsenal is not confined to application of heavy structures alone. The high levels of skill among the work force permit manufacture of items which require processing to most precise tolerances. So, in addition to the heavy structures already referred to, the arsenal also provides to the missile program items requiring extremely precise surface finishes, such as supersonic nozzles for wind tunnels, and missile models for experimental use in such wind tunnels. These high levels of skill also find application in the machining of other items such as air bearing test fixtures, inclinometer assemblies, and chuck assembly components for ABMA. The use of these skills, based upon Watertown Arsenal's many years in this and related fields, is particularly important during this period when expediting development is so vital.

Although the missile program is but one part of Watertown Arsenal's total program, it is nevertheless becoming a more and more significant part as the months go by. This work is of such a nature that it is particularly fitted to the skills and facilities which are available; and the people of the arsenal are most enthusiastic about making their full contribution to the defense of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I plead with the Members of the House not to weaken in any way our great arsenals. If you weaken them you will lose the men—the great majority of them are veterans—who have the know-how and they will get other jobs. Then when an emergency arises, our arsenals will not be able to produce. In many instances it takes a long time to teach the workers in civilian industry how to make these great projects which are so necessary for our national defense.

We hear a good deal about helping small business. We want to help small business, but we certainly do not want to help small business if it is going to

mean in the end annihilation not only of small business but of the United States.

I pray with all the strength in my being that we may keep our arsenals in full production.

SPLENDID ACTION OF JOHN D. HERTZ

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. John D. Hertz announced that he was establishing a foundation for the education of young men and women in engineering. This fund is being made available at a time when the increased costs of education are making it difficult and often impossible for our most talented youth to complete their training, and at a time when there is increasing need for trained people in the engineering field. Many more will be needed, as the years pass, to keep up with the rapidly developing technical age in which we live. Mr. Hertz is conscious of this need and through financing the education of some of our youth hopes to contribute to the well-being of the country which he says has given him so many opportunities.

Mr. Hertz was born in Vrutsky, Czechoslovakia, and was brought to this country at the age of five. Unable to continue schooling beyond the elementary grades, he worked as a newsboy, a reporter for the Chicago Record, then an automobile salesman and finally went into business for himself with the founding of the Yellow Cab Co. in Chicago in 1915. Succeeding years brought great success in the motor transportation business and the founding of another company, the Hertz U-Drive-It System, based on an entirely new idea by Mr. Hertz. The company has since expanded to include the renting of trucks and trailers as well as automobiles for people to drive themselves. It is now becoming a worldwide organization. Mr. Hertz has expanded his business interests and has moved into new fields. A vigorous man of 78, he is an active partner in the investment banking firm of Lehman Bros.

This outstanding business success for the once poor immigrant boy went along with a wide range of activity on behalf of his beloved adopted country and his fellow citizens. Mr. Hertz has used his knowledge and experience to good advantage in his country's service. During World War I he served as an adviser to the Secretary of War, receiving a decoration for distinguished service for his work in this position. Mr. Hertz has also found time for community affairs, is a trustee for the Lovelace Foundation for Medical Education and Research, and a director for an arthritis and rheumatism foundation. His concern for the defense of the country gave direction to his plans to share his fortune in a way which would contribute most and eventuated in the establishment of the Hertz Education Foundation to stimulate and assist in

the training of young men and women in the engineering profession.

Mr. Hertz will name the foundation the Fanny K. Hertz Educational Fund for Engineers, in honor of his wife, to whom he has been married 54 years. Sufficient funds are being made available immediately to subsidize more than 100 students per year. After the death of Mrs. Hertz and the 3 children, for whom life provision has been made, the entire fortune of Mr. Hertz and that of his wife will be devoted to the scholarship fund.

The foundation is noteworthy for the simplicity of its organization. There are few rules or regulations and an effort has been made to avoid all complications and exclude the redtape. The trustees are authorized to use the funds as they see fit except for one or two conditions which again reveal the breadth of the philosophy and humanity of Mr. Hertz. These are that there shall be no discrimination with respect to sex, religion, or race in awarding the scholarships and that everyone who receives a scholarship complete a course in American history as part of his studies and pledge himself also to serve the United States Government, at its request, in time of emergency.

Two features of this scholarship plan merit special attention. First, a departure from the usual provisions of scholarship funds, the Hertz Foundation may make grants for sustenance as well as for tuition and the usual school expenses. The significance of this feature of the plan is apparent when we recall the many promising young students of past years who have won scholarships but have been unable to utilize them for lack of funds to cover living expenses while they continued their studies. A second provision, also differing from most scholarship programs, allows the directors, at their discretion, to make grants to cover expenses for high school as well as for college study. Recognition is thus given to the fact that funds might be more useful at some other stage of education than college, in some instances. Aid may be furnished at either or both stages of schooling.

The career of Mr. Hertz is another example of America as the land of opportunity and of personal success accompanied by a deep interest in the highest welfare of our country. In devoting the fruits of his success to creating further educational opportunities for the youth of America in the engineering field Mr. Hertz has also shown a fine awareness of our future needs. In providing for the education of future engineers, Mr. Hertz is not only creating opportunities for many individuals but is making, through them, a very great contribution to the future welfare of the Nation. It is hoped that every success will attend the efforts of this foundation. We echo the expressed hope of Mr. Hertz, whom I have never had the pleasure of meeting, that his scholarship venture will inspire others to establish similar programs, and above all, we applaud his splendid example.

It is fitting that men like Mr. Hertz receive public commendation.

I include in my remarks an article written by Judith Crist and appearing in a recent issue of a newspaper.

HERTZ GIVING FORTUNE TO TRAIN ENGINEERS (By Judith Crist)

John D. Hertz, 78, founder of the Yellow Cab Co. and the Hertz U-Drive-It System, announced yesterday that he is devoting his fortune, totaling many millions of dollars, to the establishment of the Hertz Education Foundation to train American engineers.

Mr. Hertz, who came to this country from Austria at the age of 5 and followed the fictional tradition of rising from ragged newsboy to wealthy investment banker (he is an active partner in the banking firm of Lehman Bros.), hopes to provide scholarships for more than 100 young men and women a year to train as mechanical and electrical engineers.

"I simply want to contribute in the interest of defense, the fortune the United States has allowed me to accumulate," Mr. Hertz said. "I also hope that this scholarship venture might inspire others who have succeeded in America to come to the aid of their country by establishing their own such scholarship funds."

He decided to set up a scholarship fund to train engineers "after reading in the newspapers that Russia is producing 100 percent more engineers than this country," he explained.

Mr. Hertz said he would make available at once enough money to subsidize more than 100 students a year. Eventually, after the death of his wife and three children, for whom he has provided on a lifetime basis, his entire fortune and that of his wife will be devoted to the scholarship fund. He hopes, he said, to name the fund "The Fanny K. Hertz Educational Fund for Engineers" in honor of his wife, whom he married in 1903.

BARS DISCRIMINATION

To the board of trustees, composed of personal friends as well as Mr. and Mrs. Hertz, Mr. Hertz has given full discretion on the disbursement of funds. He stipulated only that there shall be no discrimination with respect to race, religion, or sex in giving scholarships and that all receiving aid from the fund take a course of study in American history and pledge themselves to serve the United States Government at the Government's request in time of national emergency.

FRIENDS ON BOARD

"I hope that this venture will not be a complicated operation wrapped up in red-tape or complicated rules," Mr. Hertz said, "and for this reason I have selected my personal friends to direct its application and accepted their recommendations to include trusted experts with knowledge of what other countries might be doing."

To the board of trustees, which will be authorized to use both the principal and the income as it sees fit, and which met for the first time yesterday, Mr. Hertz named Flody B. Odum, president of Atlas Corp., who will be president of the fund; Dr. Edward Teller, atomic scientist; J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI; Robert Lehman, head of Lehman Bros.; Victor Emanuel, chairman of the board of Avco Manufacturing Corp.; Leonard Florsheim, Chicago industrialist; Allan Hunter, investment analyst for Lehman Bros.; Edward L. Weisl, partner Simpson, Thatcher & Bartlett, attorneys; Harry Wyatt, personal attorney for Mr. Hertz; Arthur Hancock, outstanding Kentuckian and successful breeder and agriculturist; Joseph Rosenberg, Los Angeles branch of Lehman Bros.;

and Joe Copps, senior vice president of Hill and Knowlton, Inc.

The administrating officers, besides Mr. Odum, will be Mr. Weisl, chairman of the board; Mr. Hunter, treasurer; A. N. Huttel, assistant treasurer, and Mr. Wyatt, secretary.

WIDE LATITUDE

"The trustees of the fund may use their own good judgment as to how the scholarships may be applied," Mr. Hertz said, "and at what stage of education the application of these funds would be most useful—whether high school or college or both—and whether the moneys should be extended to sustenance as well as their education."

Mr. Hertz himself never went past the sixth grade. He began as a newsboy, became a reporter for the Chicago Record and then, after a stint as an automobile salesman, founded the Yellow Cab Co. in Chicago in 1915.

During World War I he served as an adviser to the Secretary of War on transport reorganization, and during World War II was a Special Assistant Secretary of War, receiving a decoration for distinguished service.

He and his wife own and breed thoroughbred horses. They have homes in Gary, Ill., and at 880 Fifth Avenue. His children are Mrs. J. M. Saks, Mrs. Paul L. Hexter and John D. Hertz, Jr.

POST OFFICE AT MARTINSBURG, W. VA.

THE SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

MR. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, today I have written to the General Services Administration calling attention again to the Martinsburg post office situation, pointing out the unemployment increase in that area and in the State of West Virginia.

Eighteen years ago, legislation was passed authorizing the construction of this building as it was badly needed at that time. The war came along and stopped construction. After I came to Congress, construction was again authorized but the Korean war developed and the project was stopped. I have had a bill put through Congress authorizing the beginning of construction. Certainly, if the building was needed 18 years ago, it is desperately needed now.

Construction should be started at once. This job would help the community and the unemployment situation. The building is badly needed, not only by the Post Office Department, but by all the Federal agencies in that area. I am hoping this can be included in the present plans, for a public works program to stop the recession, which the President announced February 12.

I know this construction at Martinsburg, W. Va., is fully justified on its own merits.

FLUORSPAR INDUSTRY

MR. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives a bill to provide for increased custom duties on fluorspar under certain conditions. This will enable Congress to decide whether we shall have a domestic fluorspar industry or permit it to become another casualty from imports.

The fluorspar industry is a small one, but extremely important. Fluorspar is necessary for the production of steel, aluminum, hydrofluoric acid, freon gas, and fluorocarbon compounds. It is essential to the production of atomic energy, and the fluorine derived from it is being tested as a propellant in the missile and rocket field and has been called the most promising oxidizing agent we have.

Today domestic consumption of fluorspar is at an all-time high. Consumption is increasing at a greater rate than any other mineral and will continue to do so. Yet today the domestic industry is subsisting entirely from Government purchase programs which end this year. The domestic producers share of the market has dropped from 95 percent to practically nothing. Imports have increased from less than 10 percent of the market to about 90 percent. Imports of one grade of this mineral this year exceeded domestic consumption by considerable tonnage.

Consumers can obtain imports at prices domestic producers cannot meet. Foreign production can easily be expanded and will be in order to take all of the increases in consumption which we see in the future.

Mr. Speaker, my bill will not prevent imports. I think it is an extremely reasonable one. It would save about 50 percent of the domestic market for the domestic producers. It would enable the importers to bring in about 50 percent of the consumptive requirements at the present rate of duty which has been no deterrent to imports, and would divide future increases in consumption equally with them.

My bill would enable us to maintain a domestic industry upon which we could rely in time of emergency. In other past emergencies our domestic industry has provided all of our requirements. It will enable the miners to remain employed, the local communities to continue to collect taxes and carry out their governmental functions.

No relief is available under the escape clause which would save this industry. Only by the enactment of this legislation can we provide a means whereby it can continue to operate.

Failure to enact this bill will result in the closing of the fluorspar mines in Illinois, Kentucky, Colorado, Montana, and Utah. More unemployment will be created. We will then have requests for relief funds, requests for funds to support the schools and other public activities.

I respectfully urge my colleagues in the House to give this grave problem

their serious consideration and to enact this legislation which will bring about some much needed relief for this vital industry.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5538) entitled "An act to provide that withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 58-8.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 266. Concurrent resolution requesting the return of the enrollment of (H. R. 8038) by the President to the House of Representatives for the purposes of reenrollment.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, on February 24, for 90 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN, on Monday next, for 30 minutes, and revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. PASSMAN, today, for 40 minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BAILEY, for 30 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. McCORMACK, for 15 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include an article appearing in a newspaper.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ASPINALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include related matter.

Mr. WALTER and to include editorials.

Mr. PELLY in two instances.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. BOGGS (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BREEDING (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. METCALF.

Mr. BAILEY.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLYNT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.

Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1040. An act to amend the acts known as the Life Insurance Act, approved June 19, 1934, and the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940; and

S. 2920. An act to provide for small-business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 10, 1958, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 533. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1958, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 17, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1592. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation (in liquidation) and Defense Lending Division, Office of Production and Defense Lending, Treasury Department, for

the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 330); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1593. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 331); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1594. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 9, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on the co-operative beach erosion control study of the shore of New Jersey from Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 332); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with 12 illustrations.

1595. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Annual Report of the Cooperative Extension Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 83, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1596. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to facilitate the insurance of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and the act of August 28, 1937, as amended (relating to the conservation of water resources), and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1597. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on the progress of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight training program covering the period August 1, 1956 to January 1, 1958, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 879, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1598. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic winter games, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1599. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report on the status of training of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and the progress made in strengthening of the Reserve components during fiscal year 1957, pursuant to subsection 260 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1600. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report reflecting estimated obligations by principal activities of the Small Business Administration for the period July 1 through December 31, 1957, pursuant to section 215 of the Small Business Act of 1955; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1601. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1602. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report which surveys the effects of defense expansion of machine tool supply upon the competitive status of the machine tool industry, and also containing the results of our continuing review of the outstanding voluntary agreements and programs established under section 708 (b) of the act, pursuant to section 708 (e) of the

Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1603. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of the Quarterly Report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund-Treasury Department Activities for the period ended September 30, 1957, pursuant to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act, as amended (67 Stat. 230) and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F. R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1604. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting four reports prior to restoration of balances pertaining to certain appropriation and fund accounts, pursuant to title 31, United States Code, sections 701-708, and the requirements set forth in Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-23, dated June 21, 1957; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1605. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report requesting the restoration of \$54.63 to the appropriation, "14X2271, Payment to Tillamooks and Other Indians of Oregon," to cover payment of outstanding obligations, pursuant to title 31, United States Code, sections 701-708, and Bureau of the Budget Circular A-23, dated June 21, 1957; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1606. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting a report prior to restoration of balances requesting restoration of funds to appropriation "Salaries and expenses, 6360100," pursuant to Public Law 798, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1607. A letter from the executive officer, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a report on all tort claims paid by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics for the period January 1 to December 31, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 773, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1608. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation and vessel-inspection laws"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1609. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to finance the 1961 meeting of the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses"; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6745. A bill to amend Public Law 587 by permitting the withholding by the Federal Government from wages of employees of certain taxes imposed by municipalities; with amendment (Rept. No. 1341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 7454. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation by colleges and universities of sound recordings and film to be used by them in certain nonprofit radio and television broadcasts; with amendment (Rept. No.

1342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 776. A bill to permit temporary free importation of automobiles and parts of automobiles when intended solely for show purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5411. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow or former wife divorced, who loses mother's insurance benefits by remarriage, may again become entitled if her husband dies within 1 year of such remarriage; with amendment (Rept. No. 1344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1828. An act to retrocede to the State of Montana concurrent police jurisdiction over the Blackfeet Highway and its connections with the Glacier National Park road system, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:
H. R. 10662. A bill to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic winter games, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:
H. R. 10663. A bill to check the growth of unemployment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments for the construction of needed public works and public improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASHLEY:
H. R. 10664. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to increase the benefits payable under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10665. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to authorize the Federal Housing Commissioner to purchase certain insured mortgages for the purpose of avoiding foreclosure in cases where the mortgagor is in financial straits for reasons beyond his control and could not otherwise retain his property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BAILEY:
H. R. 10666. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT:
H. R. 10667. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1946 (Public Law 551, 79th Cong.), as amended, relating to the issuance of general obligation bonds by the city of Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:
H. R. 10668. A bill authorizing maintenance of an adequate navigation channel in the Parish Line Canal, La., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 10669. A bill to provide minimum price-support levels for whole milk and butterfat during the 1-year period beginning April 1, 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10670. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10671. A bill to provide a method for computing parity prices for manufacturing milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 10672. A bill to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska:

H. R. 10673. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 10674. A bill to allow credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act for certain service in the employment of a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 10675. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELLAY:

H. R. 10676. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 10677. A bill to check the growth of unemployment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments for the construction of needed public works and public improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 10678. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 10679. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 10680. A bill to check the growth of unemployment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments for the construction of needed public works and public improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 10681. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 10682. A bill to provide for small-business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 10683. A bill to create a Small Business Capital Bank System to make available to small business a source of equity and long-term loan capital where such capital is not available on reasonable terms from existing private sources; to transfer to such system all funds which are presently available under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act for loans to industrial and commercial firms, together with certain other funds out of the

surplus accounts of the Federal Reserve banks; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 10684. A bill to increase the income limitations governing the payment of pension to widows of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 10685. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for certain amounts paid by a teacher for his further education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H. R. 10686. A bill to authorize the use of additional funds for the 1958 cotton acreage reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 10687. A bill to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic winter games, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 10688. A bill to require that commercial samples be classified as first-class mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 10689. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase minimum benefits, to provide full retirement benefits for both men and women at age 60, and to remove the limitation on the outside income which an individual may earn while receiving such benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10690. A bill to increase from \$1,200 to \$2,500 the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit under section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 10691. A bill to provide that the Army shall be maintained at a minimum strength of 929,000 members; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 10692. A bill to authorize the construction and sale by the Secretary of Commerce of two transatlantic superliners; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McFALL:

H. R. 10693. A bill to validate the conveyance of certain land in the State of California by the Central Pacific Railway Co. and the Southern Pacific Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10694. A bill to authorize the withholding from the salaries of Government employees of amounts for the payment of premiums on accident and health insurance contracts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 10695. A bill to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic winter games, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 10696. A bill to extend and liberalize the direct home-loan program for veterans, to extend the guaranteed home-loan program, to provide special assistance to paraplegic veterans under the direct home-loan program, to stimulate the making of direct farm-housing loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MONTOTOYA:

H. R. 10697. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, relating to assistance for the maintenance and operation of schools in federally impacted areas, to extend its effectiveness for 3 additional years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 10698. A bill to provide a residence for pages of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 10699. A bill to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10700. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 10701. A bill to provide for grants to States and local governments to enable them to construct needed public works and improvements and thus to provide employment for persons who are unemployed; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 10702. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer or spouse who has attained the age of 50 and is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 10703. A bill to amend title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 to increase the amount available under the college housing program for loans to provide housing for student nurses and interns at nonprofit hospitals; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 10704. A bill to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 10705. A bill to provide separate medical facilities for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10706. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1956 to extend the period during which loans and grants may be made for the construction of hospitals under the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, and to make additional funds available for that purpose; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 10707. A bill to amend section 224 of the Social Security Act to provide that there shall be no offset against social security benefits for disabled persons on account of disability retirement pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10708. A bill to amend section 224 of the Social Security Act to provide that there shall be no offset against social security benefits for disabled persons on account of death benefits paid under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10709. A bill to authorize the use of additional funds for the 1958 cotton acreage reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10710. A bill to amend section 332 of title 10 of the United States Code to limit the use of the Armed Forces to enforce Federal laws or the orders of Federal courts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky:

H. R. 10711. A bill to extend veteran benefits to persons serving in the Armed Forces

between November 12, 1918 and July 2, 1921; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 10712. A bill to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10713. A bill to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic winter games, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 10714. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to authorize the Federal Housing Commissioner to purchase certain insured mortgages for the purpose of avoiding foreclosure in cases where the mortgagor is in financial straits for reasons beyond his control and could not otherwise retain his property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 10715. A bill to alleviate the critical shortage of high quality cotton and to protect farm income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 10716. A bill to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 10717. A bill to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. R. 10718. A bill to amend certain sections of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to extend the applicability and coverage of marketing agreements and orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 10719. A bill to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 10720. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10721. A bill to provide for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 10722. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 10723. A bill to authorize the construction and sale by the Federal Maritime Board of a superliner passenger vessel equivalent to the steamship *United States*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 10724. A bill to authorize the construction and sale by the Federal Maritime Board of a passenger vessel for operation in the Pacific Ocean; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 10725. A bill to authorize the President to issue posthumously in the name of John Paul Jones a commission as an admiral in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 10726. A bill to provide for increased custom duties on fluorspar under certain conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10727. A bill to check the growth of unemployment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments for the construction of needed public works and public improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H. R. 10728. A bill to authorize the use of additional funds for the 1958 cotton acreage reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 10729. A bill to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic winter games, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 10730. A bill to amend the public-assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide increased payments, eliminate certain inequities and restrictions, and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 10731. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 267. Concurrent resolution to request the President to use his best efforts to bring about a meeting of representative citizens from all North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations to examine ways to promote greater cooperation among those nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Res. 477. Resolution to exclude from the commercial corn-producing area 38 counties in the United States during 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning the establishment in California of a soil and water conservation laboratory; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 10732. A bill for the relief of the Crum-McKinnon Building Co., of Billings, Mont.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 10733. A bill for the relief of Magnolia Airport, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 10734. A bill for the relief of Mr. Wie Hwa Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 10735. A bill for the relief of Tomko Drohomerecki (Thomas Demray); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 10736. A bill to authorize the revestment of certain interests in land at the United States Naval Ammunition and Net Depot, Seal Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 10737. A bill for the relief of Capt. Edward L. Hopper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10738. A bill for the relief of Lora Kudera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 10739. A bill for the relief of Huang Hsin Lung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 10740. A bill for the relief of Yen-An Kwan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 10741. A bill for the relief of Blanca G. Hidalgo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 10742. A bill for the relief of Taufic Deoud Gebra (also known as Taufic G. Dawd) and his wife, Hanne Elias Wehby Deoud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 10743. A bill for the relief of Nick Tsalikis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 10744. A bill for the relief of Cyril D. Djangalossoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 10745. A bill for the relief of Wayne E. Kimball; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

396. By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of Mrs. Florence Shutter, and others, of Burtrum, Minn., in support of legislation to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

397. By Mr. REUSS: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Warnke and Edward C. Warnke of Milwaukee, Wis., that Congress enact legislation amending the National Firearms Act and the Federal Firearms Act by providing that no regulations promulgated under the statute shall take effect without the express approval of the Congress; and that Congress consider evidence from all interested parties with the intention of revising, amending, or repealing the National Firearms Act and the Federal Firearms Act, as the Congress shall deem in the best public interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

398. By Mr. SCHENCK: Petition of Council of the city of Hamilton, Ohio, urging defeat of the natural gas bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

399. Also, petition of the commission of the city of Dayton, Ohio, urging defeat of the natural gas bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

400. Also, petition of the Council of Miamisburg, Ohio, urging defeat of the natural gas bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

401. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the county clerk, Wailuku, Maui, T. H., relative to the erection and maintenance of a post office at Hoolehua, island and district of Molokai, county of Maui, T. H., to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the

Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

QUARTERLY REPORT

The following reports for the third calendar quarter of 1957 were received after October 20, 1957, too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees' Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) \$324. E. (9) \$464.02.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) \$6,934.95.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, Inc., 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$1,438.85. E. (9) \$1,438.85.

A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$12,494.28. E. (9) \$11,194.28.

A. American Legion National Headquarters, Post Office Box 1055, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$2,115.43. E. (9) \$23,135.50.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$148.24. E. (9) \$4,594.99.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$52,769.47. E. (9) \$2,661.45.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) \$5,982.30.

A. AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) \$1,562.50.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$471.05.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) \$1,203.29.

A. Baker, McKenzie & Hightower, 901 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Club Managers Association of America, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) \$14.35.

A. Baker, McKenzie & Hightower, 901 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Roberts Dairy Co., 4469 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) \$780. E. (9) \$21.86.

A. J. A. Beirne, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 1306 Washington Building, Tacoma, Wash.
E. (9) \$6.10.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$3,089.06. E. (9) \$3,089.06.

A. Hudson Biery, 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) \$3,498. E. (9) \$231.66.

A. Charles B. Blankenship, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$2,782.34. E. (9) \$2,782.34.

A. Roland Boyd, 202 Central National Bank, McKinney, Tex.
B. Hub Hill, 2121 North Field Street, Dallas, Tex., and Don Elliott, Elliott Construction Co., Sherman, Tex.
D. (6) \$2,575. E. (9) \$370.09.

A. Roland Boyd, 202 Central National Bank Building, McKinney, Tex.
B. North Texas Municipal Water District, Wylie, Tex.
D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$17.48.

A. Roland Boyd, 202 Central National Bank Building, McKinney, Tex.
B. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$35.

A. Boykin & DeFrancis, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Mrs. Claire Hugo Stinnes, Grossenbaumerstrasse 253, Mulheim-Ruhr, Germany.
E. (9) \$729.05.

A. Boykin & DeFrancis, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Studiengesellschaft für Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen, e. V. Contrescarpe 46, Germany.
E. (9) \$1,301.53.

A. Mrs. Rollin Brown, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Thomas Burke, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$1,091. E. (9) \$395.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$204. E. (9) \$204.

A. Bernard N. Burnstine, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 50 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Butler & McKinney, 1624 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Richard Haster and wife, and A. E. Arnold, 2435 West First Street, Santa Ana, Calif.
D. (6) \$519.47. E. (9) \$75.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

A. Wallace J. Campbell, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Cooperative League of the U. S. A., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Cliff D. Carpenter, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$625.

A. Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) \$3,234.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 248 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$1,989.55.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 2140 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,560. E. (9) \$3,014.17.

A. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General counsel for Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Salt Producers Association, 726 La Salle-Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Conference of American Small Business Organizations, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$15,867. E. (9) \$7,001.49.

A. Communications Workers of America, 1806 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,143,765.90. E. (9) \$5,871.40.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,014.91. E. (9) \$1,014.91.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 140 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers' Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Gilbert Cox, Elliston, Va.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Robert W. Coyne, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$623.29. E. (9) \$434.74.

A. Edward B. Crosland, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Telephone and Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$4,999.99.

A. John L. Crull, 1806 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1806 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John T. Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$2,600. E. (9) \$408.

A. Joan David, 4737 36th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Counsel Associates, 211 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$250.

A. Joffre C. David, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.

B. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) \$444.39. E. (9) \$436.18.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Ontario Land Co., 807 Lonsdale Building, Duluth, Minn.
D. (6) \$5,000.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

B. Southern Pine Industry Committee.

A. John D. deButts, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$3,125.01.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$906.27.

A. Ralph B. Dewey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$766.38.

A. John M. Dickerman, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$937.50. E. (9) \$451.02.

A. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Petroleum Industry Trade Association, D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$300.

A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Committee, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$2,499.96. E. (9) \$286.40.

A. Carlyle M. Dunaway, 1800 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The National Association of Life Underwriters, 1800 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$328. E. (9) \$86.37.

A. Wm. M. Dunn, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, 500 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Rayon Staple Fiber Producers Association, Room 7319, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$19,889.25. E. (9) \$1,566.60.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 5863 Chevy Chase Parkway, Washington, D. C.

B. Contract Carriers Conference, American Trucking Association, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$166.12.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.

B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,205. E. (9) \$10.56.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$501.03. E. (9) \$19.

A. Mrs. Albert E. Farwell, Box 188, Route 1, Vienna, Va.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.

D. (6) \$3,622.80. E. (9) \$3,622.80.

A. W. Robert Fokes, 400 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

B. Florida Railroad Association, 400 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, Suite 1001-3, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$7,500.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$2,250.

A. Nolen J. Fuqua, Duncan, Okla.

B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) \$423.41. E. (9) \$423.41.

A. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Cassius B. Gravitt, Jr., 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National League of Postmasters of the United States, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$200.

A. Group Health Federation of America, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$217.

A. William A. Hanscom, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union, AFL-CIO, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) \$1,287.50. E. (9) \$225.

A. Murray Hanson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$804.86.

A. Conrad P. Harness, Suite 1117, Barr Bldg., Washington, D. C.

B. Prefabricated Home Manufacturers' Institute, Suite 1117, Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. L. S. Hitchner, Associations Building, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, Associations Building, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John R. Holden, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$75.

A. Mrs. Jency Price Houser, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$985. E. (9) \$985.

A. Housewives United, 2915 Foxhall Road NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$19.

A. Ray L. Hulick, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$501.03. E. (9) \$25.

A. W. J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.

B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
E. (9) \$521.84.

A. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,985.16. E. (9) \$1,985.16.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

E. (9) \$1,031.

A. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 820 Highland Avenue, Newark, N. J.

D. (6) \$10. E. (9) \$2,750.16.

A. William T. Jobe, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Ice Industries, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$3,240. E. (9) \$814.65.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, D. (6) \$300.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$131.25. E. (9) \$1.30.

A. J. M. DeW. (Jack) Kyle 2d, Post Office Box 1520, Washington, D. C.

B. Day-Phillips Social Security Organization, Inc., San Dionisio, Paranaque, Rizal, Republic of the Philippines.
E. (9) \$193.52.

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, 15th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Powers Luse, North Baltimore, Ohio.
B. Pennsylvania-Ohio-New Committee on Low Cost Niagara-St. Lawrence Power, Box 187, North Baltimore, Ohio.
D. (6) \$832.22. E. (9) \$915.79.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$875. E. (9) \$637.08.

A. Charlton H. Lyons, Sr., 1500 Beck Building, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) \$8070.01.

A. J. A. McCallam, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Veterinary Medical Association, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) \$471.05.

A. Charles B. McCarthy, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$390. E. (9) \$152.57.

A. Robert S. McClelland, Duncan, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. William A. McClintock, Jr., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.

B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. Clarence A. McGillen, Jr., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Parcel Post Association, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$1,200.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,750. E. (9) \$161.45.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$938.

A. Francis J. McNamara, 610 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) \$2,062.50. E. (9) \$25.80.

A. MacLeigh, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$5,545. E. (9) \$364.96.

A. Harry B. Madsen, 1559 North McKinley Road, Lake Forest, Ill.

B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,365. E. (9) \$320.98.

A. James D. Mann, 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,802.

A. Marks & Trowbridge, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Basic Industries Power Committee, 400 Erie County Savings Bank Building, Buffalo, N. Y.

D. (6) \$1,355. E. (9) \$211.02.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 409, Washington, D. C.

B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL-CIO, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,040. E. (9) \$2,298.18.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1908 Q Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, AFL-CIO, 1710 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$1,344. E. (9) \$93.45.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1908 Q Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Retail, Wholesale & Department Store Union, AFL-CIO, 132 West 43d Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$675. E. (9) \$118.50.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Northern Textile Association, Maytag Co., and Quinebaug-French Rivers Manufacturers Association.

D. (6) \$2,650. E. (9) \$551.23.

A. Marlon S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.

B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Moot, Sprague, Marcy & Quick, 400 Erie County Savings Bank Building, Buffalo, N. Y.

B. Basic Industries Power Committee, 400 Erie County Savings Bank Bldg., Buffalo, N. Y.

D. (6) \$1,700. E. (9) \$1,679.88.

A. Kenneth R. Morefield, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.

B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) \$20.83. E. (9) \$66.88.

A. Silas A. Morehouse, Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.

B. F. W. Clarke, 112 North St. Asaph Street, Alexandria, Va.

A. Silas A. Morehouse, Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.

B. Silk, Inc., Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.

A. Andrew P. Murphy, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$203.91.

A. John H. Myers, 1224 Cleveland Street, Wilmette, Ill.

B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,243.30. E. (9) \$892.18.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$10,213.94. E. (9) \$15,136.32.

A. National Association of Life Underwriters, 1800 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,424.55. E. (9) \$3,424.55.

A. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, Inc., 1219 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, Imperial, Nebr.

D. (6) \$847.90. E. (9) \$847.90.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

E. (9) \$6,615.51.

A. National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$1,947.54. E. (9) \$1,000.43.

A. National Counsel Associates, 211 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Airlines Association, Washington, D. C., City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa., and Association of First Class Mailers, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$6,166. E. (9) \$5,345.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$317,481.60. E. (9) \$2,101.23.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$9,303.68. E. (9) \$9,303.68.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

E. (9) \$802.21.

A. National Postal Committee for Books, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$11,500.17. E. (9) \$11,805.39.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$862.92. E. (9) \$610.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$10,262.38. E. (9) \$8,006.49.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$4,013.68. E. (9) \$4,897.26.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,597.43. E. (9) \$2,046.35.

A. John W. Nerlinger, Jr., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.

B. National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$187.50.

A. Northern Hemlock & Hardwood Manufacturers' Association, Washington Boulevard, Oshkosh, Wis.
D. (6) \$100.

A. Robert J. O'Connell, Interstate Circuit, Majestic Theater Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Charles A. Parker, Room 714, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Aviation Trades Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$51.52.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$562.50. E. (9) \$64.55.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) \$24.80.

A. Iris Peterson, 4201 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Line Stewards & Stewardesses Association, International, 55th and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Kenneth Peterson, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,031.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, Room 301, Bond Building, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America affiliated with American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N. J.
D. (6) \$2,538.42. E. (9) \$1,906.47.

A. Philco Corp., Tloga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$65.

A. Prefabricated Home Manufacturers' Institute, Suite 1117, Barr Building, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Mrs. R. I. C. Prout, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Gordon M. Quarnstrom, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., Room 607, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cancer Society, Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, United Cerebral Palsy Associations, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, and National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$7,749.97. E. (9) \$4,671.98.

A. Mrs. Richard G. Radue, 3406 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$4,250. E. (9) \$642.88.

A. Otle M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Creameries Association, 817 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) \$1,875. E. (9) \$1,209.10.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, Imperial, Nebr.
D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$97.90.

A. John Arthur Reynolds, 653 Cortland Avenue, Fresno, Calif.
B. Western Cotton Growers Association of California, 2201 F Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
D. (6) \$3,150. E. (9) \$579.46.

A. Arthur Rhorer, 301-303 Peoples Building, Middlesborough, Ky.
B. Miss Marie B. Kraus, 2500 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$4,000.

A. Bill Richards, Orleans, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Harry H. Rieck, Preston, Md.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. George D. Riley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$2,899. E. (9) \$478.15.

A. Maurice Rosenblatt, 316 A Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Counsel Associates, 211 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$2,100.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. General Petroleum Corp., Los Angeles; Richfield Oil Corp., Los Angeles; Shell Oil Co., San Francisco; Standard Oil Company of California, San Francisco; Tidewater Oil Co., San Francisco; Union Oil Co., Los Angeles.
D. (6) \$600.

A. Selva & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Carpet Institute, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$200.34.

A. Selva & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago Mercantile Exchange, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$1,042.

A. Selva & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,249.98. E. (9) \$55.12.

A. Selva & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, 113 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$42.15.

A. Donald H. Sharp, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$2,250.

A. Paul Sifton, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$2,418. E. (9) \$2,442.13.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$2,459. E. (9) \$8,394.99.

A. John A. Smith, Post Office Box 9063, Denver, Colo.
B. Continental Air Lines, Inc., Post Office Box 9063, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) \$1,629.50.

A. Lucius S. Smith III, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. American Thrift Assembly, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$3,600. E. (9) \$132.69.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 2140 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,061.35.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Room 812, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$3,597. E. (9) \$857.31.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) \$3,912.61. E. (9) \$3,220.32.

A. Mrs. Ada B. Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$42.83. E. (9) \$42.83.

A. Francis W. Stover, 610 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) \$1,437.50. E. (9) \$53.20.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 829 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

A. William L. Sturdevant, Jr., 8300 Burdette Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Counsel Associates, 211 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$2,100.

A. Texas Committee of Correspondence, Post Office Box 912, Austin, Tex.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$1,817.27.

A. Eugene M. Thore, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$2,062.50. E. (9) \$34.34.

A. Richard A. Tilden, 441 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. R. E. Schanzer, Inc., 608-12, South Peters Street, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) \$156.25. E. (9) \$2.91.

A. Clarence D. Todd, 1825 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Contract Carrier Conference, American Trucking Association, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$5,000.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., and Townsend National Weekly, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hugh C. Tuttle, Dover, N. H.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 369 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) \$1,336.99.

A. Universal Research and Consultants, Inc., 221 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Republic of Cuba, Post Office Box 1383, Habana, Cuba; the Republic of Venezuela, 2445 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; and Arab States Delegation Office, 120 East 56th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$1,808.90.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$75.83.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.

B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association and the Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$12,000. E. (9) \$385.69.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.

E. (9) \$55.28.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$118.92.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$126.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.

E. (9) \$626.72.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$17,276.51. E. (9) \$918.07.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) \$18.49.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.

B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,977.08. E. (9) \$1,977.08.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$25.

A. Kenneth Williamson, Mills Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,568.87. E. (9) \$382.66.

A. Frank G. Wollney, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$83.80.

A. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,375. E. (9) \$39.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1957:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th

(Mark one square only)

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

- (i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
- (ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
- (b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
 - (i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
 - (ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated,

☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description; (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution; (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◀

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◀

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes anything of value. When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) **IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.**—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of \$500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) **IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.**—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of \$500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to \$500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this Report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. \$.....Dues and assessments
2. \$.....Gifts of money or anything of value
3. \$.....Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. \$.....Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. \$.....Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. \$.....TOTAL for this Quarter (Add Items "1" through "5")
7. \$.....Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. \$.....TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

- "The term 'contribution' includes a . . . loan . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).
9. \$.....TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
 10. \$.....Borrowed from others during this Quarter
 11. \$.....Repaid to others during this Quarter
 12. \$....."Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of \$500 or more

(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no":
14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total \$500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	Name and Address of Contributor
	("Period" from Jan. 1 through 19....)
\$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
\$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
\$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E."—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) **IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.** In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. \$.....Public relations and advertising services
2. \$.....Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. \$.....Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. \$.....Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. \$.....Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. \$.....Telephone and telegraph
7. \$.....Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. \$.....All other expenditures
9. \$.....TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. \$.....Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. \$.....TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . loan . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. \$.....TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. \$.....Lent to others during this Quarter
14. \$.....Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of \$10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	Date or Dates	Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose
\$1,750.00	7-11:	Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
\$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15:	Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at \$800.00 per month.
\$4,150.00		TOTAL

A. Claris Adams, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$87.20.

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) \$2.45.

A. Arthur F. Aebersold, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,442.55.

A. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$5,085. E. (9) \$6,124.01.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$4,235.80. E. (9) \$4,235.80.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. William B. Allen, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) \$2,080. E. (9) \$336.70.

A. Thomas H. Alphin, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
9. (6) \$925. E. (9) \$433.93.

A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) \$6,568.43. E. (9) \$6,568.43.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$7,418.31. E. (9) \$7,418.31.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$21,877. E. (9) \$21,877.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, AFL-CIO Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) \$34,626.77.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$7,063.79. E. (9) \$6,510.36.

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) \$378.81.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$156,893.99.

A. American Hull Insurance Syndicate, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) \$400.

A. American Humane Association, 896 Pennsylvania Street, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) \$1,249.98.

A. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) \$400.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$469.99. E. (9) \$380.51.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$15,000. E. (9) \$12,745.58.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (7) \$104,645.58. E. (9) \$3,000.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc. (Development Fund-Legislature), care of Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$454.79. E. (9) \$454.79.

A. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$14,960.47. E. (9) \$446.89.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$84. E. (9) \$10,271.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$39,851.88. E. (9) \$9,428.22.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$4,757.23. E. (9) \$4,757.23.

A. American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 60 Battery March Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) \$1.20.

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) \$4,573.11.

A. AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) \$1,562.50.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$482.61.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, Merchandise Division, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,585. E. (9) \$1,675.82.

A. Samuel W. Anderson, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Watch Association, Inc., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$6,249.99.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.

B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1115 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.

B. Class 1 railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) \$1,125.04.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$4,745.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$7,089.27. E. (9) \$7,089.27.

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$2,076.96. E. (9) \$2,076.96.

A. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$250.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 2, Box 406, Vienna, Va.

B. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$2.25.

A. George P. Baker, Soldiers Field Post Office, Boston, Mass.

B. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. John A. Baker.

B. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$3,015.49. E. (9) \$688.06.

A. J. H. Ballew, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.

D. (6) \$2,600.

A. N. C. Banfield, 110 Seward Street, Juneau, Alaska.

B. Klukwan Iron Ore Corp., 110 Seward Street, Juneau, Alaska.

A. Hartman Barber, Room 301, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) \$2,184.07. E. (9) \$683.45.

A. Barnes, Dechert, Price, Myers & Rhoads, 1600 Three Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) \$303.33.

A. James M. Barnes, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Reciprocal Inter-Insurers Federal Tax Committee, United Artists Building, Detroit, Mich.

E. (9) \$170.68.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$595.85. E. (9) \$62.54.

A. Irvin L. Barney, Room 303, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) \$2,625.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Harry S. Beer, Jr., 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$34.

A. Bert Bell, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.

B. National Football League, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
E. (9) \$3,612.57.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$4,500.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 1306 Washington Building, Tacoma, Wash.

A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) \$1.25.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,556. E. (9) \$248.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL-CIO, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hudson Biery, 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The American Institute of Marine Underwriters, The Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Hull Insurance Syndicate.
D. (6) \$800. E. (9) \$60.

A. Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Massachusetts Protective Association, Worcester, Mass.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$487.50.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$500.

A. Wm. Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Mrs. Paul Blanshard, 408 A Street NE., Washington, D. C.

B. Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, Educational Organizations.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$120.

A. Blum, Lindsey & Powell, 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 9 South William Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$74.75.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Investment Companies, 61 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Paul H. Bolton, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Wholesalers, Inc., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hyman Bookbinder, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,122. E. (9) \$663.35.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$375. E. (9) \$356.91.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, Room 502, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$90.

A. R. B. Bowden, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Harold P. Braman, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Savings & Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$525.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Frank P. Brennan, Avoca, Iowa.
B. Iowa Power & Light Co., Des Moines, Iowa.

A. Homer L. Brinkley.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$541.23.

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1122 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) \$3,238.12. E. (9) \$3,238.12.

A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$512.50.

A. J. D. Brown, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$356.25. E. (9) \$408.27.

A. Mrs. Rollin Brown, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$50.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) \$1,429.63. E. (9) \$79.63.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. The Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
D. (6) \$1,350. E. (9) \$242.65.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., 1918 N. Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y., and 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y., and National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. John J. Burke, 1062 West Platinum, Butte, Mont.

B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Post Office Box 1445, Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) \$200.

A. Thomas Burke, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$1091. E. (9) \$395.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) \$11,175.

A. Robert M. Burr, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Mica Industry Tariff Committee, Spruce Pine, N. C.
D. (6) \$2,305.80. E. (9) \$35.50.

A. Robert M. Burr, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$58. E. (9) \$108.98.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$2,874.99.

A. Charles C. Butler, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$270. E. (9) \$1.91.

A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.

B. United States Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.

A. Lawrence V. Byrnes, 401 3d Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) \$3,313.50.

A. C. G. Caffrey, Suite 504, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) \$760.20. E. (9) \$18.

A. Leonard J. Calhoun, 411 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, 304 Empire Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$388.21.

A. Campaign for the 48 States, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$7,013.23. E. (9) \$8,613.07.

A. Carl C. Campbell, Room 502, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$2,961.48. E. (9) \$296.15.

A. Wallace J. Campbell, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Cooperative League of the U. S. A., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$1,000.

A. John T. Carlton, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Cliff D. Carpenter, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. T. C. Carroll, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$168.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$2,242.73.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Larry Cates, 1143 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Air Line Pilots Association, 55th Street and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$3,181.72.

A. Francis R. Cawley, Room 1005, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$735. E. (9) \$286.42.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. M. Golodetz & Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Great Eastern Shipping Co., Ltd., 14 Jamshedji Tata Road, Bombay, India.
D. (6) \$600.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) \$3,282.68. E. (9) \$4,695.35.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$151.54.

A. Omer W. Clark, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) \$2,919.72.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Clarence E. Cleveland, Montpelier, Vt.
B. Vermont State Railroads Association, Montpelier, Vt.

A. Herman Clott, 711 14th Street NW. (room 600), Washington, D. C.

B. International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, Suite 412, Tabor Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) \$1,540.50. E. (9) \$857.18.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. The American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) \$128.66.

A. Don C. Collins, Kit Carson, Colo.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 90 John Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$30. E. (9) \$282.37.

A. Committee on Foreign Policy Legislation, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$2,847. E. (9) \$1,109.37.

A. Committee for Oil Pipe Lines, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

E. (9) \$325.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$21,600. E. (9) \$17,389.55.

A. Lawrence R. Condon, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. Estate of Mary Clark deBrabant and Mrs. Katherine C. Williams, care of Mr. Rodney W. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$13,120.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Conference on State Defense, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Orval R. Cook, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Raymond A. Cook, 2200 Gulf Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N. C.

A. Cooper & Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Fountain Pen & Mechanical Pencil Manufacturers' Association, Inc., 1426 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Cooper & Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wilmer A. Cooper, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$155.77.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$2,538.79.

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Room 901, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Room 901, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$195. E. (9) \$20.

A. Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$350. E. (9) \$3,888.37.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$259.79. E. (9) \$259.79.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$57.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Chicago and North Western Railway System, 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution 1955 Legislature, P. O. Box 3170, Honolulu, Hawaii, U. S. A.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) \$1.66.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Nickel Co., Inc., 67 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Edward B. Crosland, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$4,999.99.

A. John W. Cross, 920 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Deutsche Amerikakohlen-Transportgesellschaft (American German Coal Transport Co.), 17 Grabenstrasse, Dusseldorf, Germany.

A. Paul Cunningham, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. John T. Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$2,736.80. E. (9) \$306.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
D. (6) \$675.

A. Bernard Cushman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Charles L. Cusumano, 42 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Vincenzo Buttaro, 64 Nelson Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., and Miss Domenica Buttaro, Via Zuccarino No. 76, Mola di Bari, Province of Bari, Italy.
E. (9) \$32.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,062.50. E. (9) \$17.93.

A. Bertram G. Davis, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$1,710.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Ontario Land Co., 807 Lonsdale Building, Duluth, Minn.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) \$337.32.

A. Joseph B. Davis, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$75.43.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson and Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Watch Association, Inc., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$4,250.22.

A. John D. deButts, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$3,125.01.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$57.50.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Philip M. DeVany, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,250.

A. R. T. DeVany, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$3,900. E. (9) \$1,300.

A. George J. Dietz, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$24.12.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Sacramento-Yolo Port District, California Fruit Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) \$2,662.85. E. (9) \$37.85.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Westlands Water District, Post Office Box 406, Fresno, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,847.67. E. (9) \$97.67.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.

E. (9) \$4,507.22.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

E. (9) \$3,125.

A. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Petroleum Industry Trade Association.

D. (6) \$459.50. E. (9) \$459.50.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 303 Medical Science Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$17,310.08. E. (9) \$17,690.93.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

E. (9) \$18,104.51.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$462.50. E. (9) \$49.04.

A. James L. Donnelly, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,624.99.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$118.75.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Room 906, Washington, D. C.

B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Room 906, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,474.39.

A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Committee, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$2,500.10. E. (9) \$195.95.

A. W. A. Dozler, Jr., 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.

B. The Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$225.

A. Ben DuBois.

B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

D. (6) \$3,300.

A. Stephen M. DuBrul, 11-134 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. R. Dunkerley, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$650.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 502 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Stephen F. Dunn, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William E. Dunn, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.

D. (6) \$10,000.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3.40. E. (9) \$57.09.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$140. E. (9) \$15.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.

B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,235.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Otis H. Ellis, Suite 1128, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Oil Jobbers Council, Suite 1135, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$4,000.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,550. E. (9) \$175.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$2,000.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Department of Water Resources, State of California, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) \$12.50.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,200.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.

D. (6) \$2,100.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$6,900.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$325.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.

B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.

E. (9) \$10.20.

A. Family Tax Association, 1616 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) \$9,300.

A. The Farmers Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$24,485.32. E. (9) \$19,914.41.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Inc., South Bay, Fla.; American Sugar Cane League of the U. S. A., New Orleans, La.; United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.

D. (6) \$5,850.

A. Financial General Corp., 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Joel H. Fisher, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Civil Aviation Medical Association, 150 East 71st Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$225.

A. John B. Fisher, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Coal Shipping, Inc., 17 State Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$3,750.

A. John B. Fisher, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Bangor & Aroostook Railroad, 84 Harlow Street, Bangor, Maine.
D. (6) \$3,750.

A. John B. Fisher, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

B. C. H. Sprague & Son Co., 10 Post Office Square, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) \$3,333.33.

A. Norman A. Flaningham, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$3.95.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. Rust Prevention Association, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) \$2,499.99. E. (9) \$229.76.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual (Legislative Fund), Lakeland, Fla.

E. (9) \$1,841.50.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

E. (9) \$1,429.63.

A. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

D. (6) \$12,313.75. E. (9) \$6,608.86.

A. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

E. (9) \$1,592.31.

A. W. Robert Fokes, 400 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

B. Florida Railroad Association, 400 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.

B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.

A. Forest Farmers Association, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. James W. Foristel, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$725. E. (9) \$177.86.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$34.20.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$2,250.

A. Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Bulova Watch Co., Inc., Bulova Park, Flushing, N. Y.

D. (6) \$410.

A. Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Retail Drug-ists.

D. (6) \$3,900. E. (9) \$1,124.

A. Walter Freedman, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. Patchogue-Plymouth Corp., 261 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

E. (9) \$11.95.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberg, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.

E. (9) \$1,587.50.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$22,164.34. E. (9) \$5,475.02.

A. George Miller Fuller, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Henry T. Gage, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.

B. Minnesota Railroads.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$10.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Gus F. Geissler, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. General Gas Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

E. (9) \$194.82.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. National Association of Direct Selling

Companies, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,177.50. E. (9) \$27.70.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Lelf Gilstad, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Transportation Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Henry W. Goodall, 28 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

D. (6) \$1,875.

A. Nathaniel H. Goodrich, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. John A. Gosnell, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$375.

A. Government Employees' Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$6,239.60. E. (9) \$6,154.90.

A. Government Relations Committee of the Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. James L. Grahl, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.

E. (9) \$11.36.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318-418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

D. (6) \$19,386.90. E. (9) \$10,021.46.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$60. E. (9) \$1.50.

A. Richard D. Green, 515 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Editorial Association, 608 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,875.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 1001 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) \$6,000.

A. I. J. Gromfine, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Carl O. Gustafson, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

E. (9) \$11,901.66.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

B. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,560. E. (9) \$507.88.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$238.60.

A. Hal H. Hale, 423 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Radford Hall, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$725. E. (9) \$7.16.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$2,874.96. E. (9) \$374.28.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Transportation Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Murray Hanson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$835.76.

A. Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Committee, 1145 19th Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$13,034.50.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Conrad P. Harness, Suite 1117, Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$666.66. E. (9) \$8.90.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

B. National Economic Council, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

B. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) \$1,805.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Committee, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$2,133.35. E. (9) \$3,312.64.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

60 John Street, New York, N. Y.; and 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Kit H. Haynes.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, Suite 801, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.

E. (9) \$7.15.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$150.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$75. E. (9) \$595.17.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Savings & Loan League, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$325.

A. Chas. H. Heitzel, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Joseph D. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.

B. American Association of Small Business, Inc., 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Willon A. Henderson, 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. General Petroleum Corp., 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. William B. Henderson, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Parcel Post Association, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,601. E. (9) \$3,601.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$1,489.91. E. (9) \$364.91.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y., and 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$116.90. E. (9) \$116.90.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$41.70.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, Post Office Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Football League, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala Cynwyd, Pa.

E. (9) \$249.65.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$53.40.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$196.88.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

E. (9) \$1,114.75.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, Room 204, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. John R. Holden, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Fuller Holloway, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N. Y.

A. Richard C. Holmquist, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$920. E. (9) \$446.03.

A. Winfield M. Homer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$300.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

E. (9) \$337.32.

A. Lawrence W. Horning, 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

B. New York Central Railroad Co., 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. Cline House, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,725.

A. Vernon F. Hovey, 101 Nott Terrace, Schenectady, N. Y.

B. National Dairy Products Corp., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$1,059.41.

A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,649.99. E. (9) \$1,297.97.

A. Harold K. Howe, 307 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., 307 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$2,400.

A. Erma D. Hubbard, Route 4, Box 235, Annapolis, Md.

B. Military Survivors, Inc., Route 4, Box 235, Annapolis, Md.

A. B. A. Hungerford, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.

B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$275.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, Room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$925.17.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$32,365.91.

A. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$1.25.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

E. (9) \$1,797.

A. International Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$165.

A. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

E. (9) \$1,769.58.

A. Nelson P. Jackson, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Atomic Products Division, General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.

A. Robert C. Jackson, Suite 504, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.

D. (6) \$1,925. E. (9) \$158.17.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Daniel Jaspán, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$2,487.50. E. (9) \$16.

A. William T. Jobe, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Ice Industries, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Peter D. Joers, Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,979.04. E. (9) \$268.26.

A. W. D. Johnson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. George Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

E. (9) \$20.60.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 705 Warner Building, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The United States Potters Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$630.76.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$218.73.

A. Max M. Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Lipschultz, Altman, Geraghty & Mulally, Esq., 530 Minnesota Building, St. Paul, Minn.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$3,240. E. (9) \$695.35.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$159.50.

A. James C. Kelley, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. William Edward Kelly, 9532 Justine Drive, Falls Church, Va.

B. The Mosaic Tile Co., Zanesville, Ohio.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Estate of Mary Clark deBrabant and Mrs. Katherine C. Williams, in care of Rodney W. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$31,875.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Mrs. M. Veronica Depataky, 7965 Fareholm Drive, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$750.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William J. Kennard, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$687.50. E. (9) \$225.88.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$319.75.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$3,375. E. (9) \$394.53.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 610 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) \$9,825. E. (9) \$245.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,432.60. E. (9) \$1,257.38.

A. John A. Killick, Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$12.50. E. (9) \$1.50.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$221.25. E. (9) \$92.50.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Minot, DeBlois & Maddison, 298 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$97.62.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$43.75.

A. Ludlow King, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. King & Noble, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributors, 30 East Cedar Street, Chicago, Ill., et al.
E. (9) \$918.92.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$1.75.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$390. E. (9) \$29.60.

A. C. W. Kitchen, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Klukwan Iron Ore Corp., 110 Seward Street, Juneau, Alaska.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$2,052.

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert M. Koch, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Inst., Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) \$27.

A. Robert M. Koch, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Crushed Limestone Inst., Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) \$10.

A. Germaine Krettek, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$2,169.71.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Frank W. Kuehl, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$575. E. (9) \$40.92.

A. J. M. DeW. (Jack) Kyle 2d, Post Office Box 1520, Washington, D. C.
B. Dav-Philans Social Security Organization, Inc., San Dionisio, Paranaque, Rizal, Republic of the Philippines.
D. (6) \$525. E. (9) \$488.11.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 3d Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$2,719.16. E. (9) \$4,122.80.

A. Lake Carriers' Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. A. M. Lampley, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) \$2,750.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$260.12.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) \$1,000.12.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 718 Insurance Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) \$1,275.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$416.63.

A. J. Austin Latimer, Suite 1138, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$450.

A. John Lawler, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$175.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$301.15.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$4,500. E. (9) \$4,013.10.

A. G. E. Leighty, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$4,999.98. E. (9) \$2,121.04.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$6,413.12. E. (9) \$6,413.12.

A. Arthur Y. Lloyd, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Exports Association, Inc., Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$3.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$500.01. E. (9) \$50.42.

A. Walter J. Little, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$247.92. E. (9) \$35.

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Oil Pipe Lines, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) \$325.

A. Leonard Lopez, Room 303, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Room 303, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,750.21. E. (9) \$15.

A. Joe T. Lovett, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Harold O. Love, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$98.

A. Harold O. Love, Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$100.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
 B. National Cannery Association, 1133 20th Street, Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$750.

A. Lowenstein, Pitcher, Spence, Hotchkiss, Amann & Parr, 25 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
 D. (6) \$750.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Emmco Insurance Co., South Bend, Ind.
 D. (6) \$500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Regular Common Carrier Conference, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Republic of Panama, Panama, Panama.
 D. (6) \$500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Roadside Business Association, 646 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc., 375 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
 D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Western Medical Corporation, 415-423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place, South, New York, N. Y.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,962.50. E. (9) \$12.25.

A. A. E. Lyon, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association.
 D. (6) \$900.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 D. (6) \$541.67.

A. Charlton H. Lyons, Sr., Suite 1500 Beck Building, Shreveport, La.
 E. (9) \$4,516.08.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. A. McCallam, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

E. (9) \$482.61.

A. William C. McCamant, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$1,000.

A. John A. McCart, Room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$2,055.55. E. (9) \$4.80.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$799.80. E. (9) 152.32.

A. Angus McDonald.

B. The Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,899.96. E. (9) \$240.25.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 423 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert P. McElroy, 801 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
 E. (9) \$81.85.

A. A. J. McFarland, 126 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.

B. Christian Amendment Movement.
 D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Taxpayers, U. S. A., 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$648.60. E. (9) \$35.72.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
 D. (6) \$373.50. E. (9) \$3.86.

A. Francis J. McNamara, 610 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$14.80.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
 D. (6) \$425.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. American Optometric Association, Inc., Development Fund (Legislative), 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. Frankel Brothers, 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) 1181.25. E. (9) \$756.11.

A. Maclay, Morgan & Williams, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Don Mahon, Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D. C.

E. (9) \$307.61.

A. William J. Mahon, 1 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. Associated Railroads of New York State.

A. John H. Mahoney, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Seaboard & Western Airlines, Inc., 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.

B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$600.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.

B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$188.60.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$2,375. E. (9) \$2,375.

A. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N. Y.
 D. (6) \$1,625.78. E. (9) \$64.70.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$3,802.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
 D. (6) \$2,499.99. E. (9) \$465.82.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112-18 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paul Marshall, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$79.33. E. (9) \$8.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 1217 Hurley-Wright Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 D. (6) \$200.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$2,676. E. (9) \$1,006.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 B. The Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. P. H. Mathews, 926 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$279. E. (9) \$85.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$79.29.

A. The Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
 D. (6) \$1,300. E. (9) \$2,725.

A. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Ellis E. Meredith, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. American Association of Nurserymen, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Ross A. Messer, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$97.48.

A. J. T. Metcalf, 1002 L. & N. Building, Louisville, Ky.
 E. (9) \$437.75.

A. James G. Michaux, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$237.75.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
 E. (9) \$1,272.79.

A. Louis J. Michot, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$39.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Chamber of Commerce of the U. S. A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Military Survivors, Inc., Route 4, Box 235, Annapolis, Md.
 D. (6) \$211. E. (9) \$426.89.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Blue Cross Association, 55 East 34th Street, New York, N. Y.
 D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$20.91.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Blue Shield Medical Care Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$157.62.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Cornelia S. Roberts.
 D. (6) \$175. E. (9) \$7.83.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
 B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
 D. (6) \$2,200.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
 B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 1028 Electric Building, Houston, Tex.
 D. (6) \$2,250.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
 B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
 D. (6) \$2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
 B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
 D. (6) \$2,337. E. (9) \$89.98.

A. Harold C. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
 D. (6) \$1,800. E. (9) \$283.64.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Tennessee Products and Chemical Corp., Nashville, Tenn.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., Robert K. Elfier, and Richard A. Mullens (Rogan & Hartson), 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
 D. (6) \$2,000.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 E. (9) \$1,559.19.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Vocational Association, Inc.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$1,650.

A. Albert H. Monacelli, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
 B. National Committee for Municipal Bonds, Inc., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
 D. (6) \$4,850. E. (9) \$1,794.88.

A. Donald Montgomery, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
 D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$125.35.

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
 B. Maryland Railroad Associations, care of E. H. Burgess, Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
 D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$116.79.

A. Silas A. Morehouse, Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.
 B. F. W. Clarke, 112 North St. Asaph Street, Alexandria, Va.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Whiteford, Hart, Carmody & Wilson, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$1,249.98. E. (9) \$281.94.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Brewers' Association of America, 188 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Ford Motor Co., 3000 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Lewis, Field, DeGoff & Stein, Penthouse, DeYoung Building, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Salzer Water District, Post Office Box 488, Corcoran, Calif.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. West Coast Pipeline Co., Mercantile Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

A. Giles Morrow, President and General Counsel, Freight Forwarders Institute, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$4,999.98. E. (9) \$81.70.

A. H. S. Mosebrook, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$3,756. E. (9) \$401.30.

A. William J. Mougey, Washington, D. C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$300.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$118.75.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Co-op, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Paul A. Nagle, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Postal Transport Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$3,000.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,356.90. E. (9) \$1,356.90.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) \$14,300.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$553.95. E. (9) \$8,169.93.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$3,394.81. E. (9) \$7,309.85.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$7,250. E. (9) \$5,757.06.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$9,173.92. E. (9) \$1,400.26.

A. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, Inc., 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$14,579. E. (9) \$682.50.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., Box 337, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) \$28.88. E. (9) \$140.47.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$454,748.70. E. (9) \$3,094.57.

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Committee for Municipal Bonds, Inc., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$4,850. E. (9) \$3,294.88.

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, Room 601, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders.
E. (9) \$4,000.

A. The National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$4,074.50. E. (9) \$2,606.71.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$1,745.90. E. (9) \$1,745.90.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$121.57. E. (9) \$601.25.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$271.85. E. (9) \$271.85.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$1,757.74. E. (9) \$1,757.74.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$91,521.70. E. (9) \$8,604.43.

A. National Federation of Independent Bus, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$6,512.65. E. (9) \$6,512.65.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Suite 502, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$149,758.17. E. (9) \$15,052.41.

A. National Food Brokers Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,310. E. (9) \$1,310.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$8,452.03. E. (9) \$12,906.60.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$525.50. E. (9) \$1,489.69.

A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) \$1,805.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$10,276.42. E. (9) \$9.62.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$698. E. (9) \$698.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) \$750.03.

A. National Postal Transport Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Room 403, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$7,780.28. E. (9) \$7,780.28.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$14,421. E. (9) \$10,496.23.

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$4,125. E. (9) \$4,573.44.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,485. E. (9) \$6,516.83.

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$202.73. E. (9) \$850.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$13,412.21. E. (9) \$15,893.76.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$33,893.22. E. (9) \$3,261.68.

A. National Tax Relief Coalition, 2309 Pine Craft Road, Greensboro, N. C.
B. L. S. Franklin, 2309 Pine Craft Road, Greensboro, N. C.
D. (6) \$625. E. (9) \$935.

A. The National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) \$469.65. E. (9) \$1,768.59.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) \$45,508.50. E. (9) \$2,965.81.

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy, Room 400, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$26,775. E. (9) \$12,328.37.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William S. Neal.
B. National Association of Manufacturers of the U. S. A., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$297.

A. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) \$4,250. E. (9) \$4,095.22.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) \$3,000.

A. Henry G. Nolda, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$2,307.72. E. (9) \$64.32.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$262.50. E. (9) \$17.15.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Northern Hemlock & Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis.
D. (6) \$100.

A. E. M. Norton, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$28.

A. Brice O'Brien, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,250.

A. George J. O'Brien, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Herbert R. O'Connor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,200.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$3,125.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$11.36.

A. E. L. Oliver, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Robert Oliver, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$2,370.

A. Samuel Omasta, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) \$10.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) \$4,356.63.

A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Vaux Owen, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$2,884.62. E. (9) \$74.15.

A. Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$1,624.99.

A. Edwin F. Padberg, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Post Office Box 356, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$207.01.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$3,500. E. (9) \$17.40.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 605 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Maryland Electronic Manufacturing Co., College Park, Md.; W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa; and Record Industry Association of America, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$300.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 1145 19th Street NW., Suite 504, Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) \$337.50. E. (9) \$54.73.

A. Perry S. Patterson, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers Association, 1603 Orrington Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

A. James G. Patton.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert T. Patton, 1008 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Shell Oil Co., 1008 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$378.81. E. (9) \$29.98.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, in care of White & Case, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,916.66. E. (9) \$66.98.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Family Tax Association, 1616 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.,
E. (9) \$69.27.

A. Francis E. Perkins, 21 School Street, Concord, N. H.
B. Boston and Maine Railroad, North Station, Boston, Mass.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) \$1,800. E. (9) \$41.50.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, 208 South Tennessee, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Peoples Lobby, Inc.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.

B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$30.60.

A. Philco Corporation, Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. E. Phillips, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Standard Oil Company of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$100.

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.

B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$65.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$17.40.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 220-221 Lubbock National Building, Lubbock, Tex.

D. (6) \$30,518.30. E. (9) \$3,275.

A. Kenneth M. Plaisted, 152 West Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 315, Milwaukee, Wis.

B. National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Inc., 152 West Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 315, Milwaukee, Wis.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$1,530.50.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Nelson J. Post, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$10.

A. Prefabricated Home Manufacturers' Institute, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$25,563.75. E. (9) \$2,045.10.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$4,800.

A. Herman P. Presser, P. O. Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., P. O. Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) \$10.

A. Allen I. Pretzman, 150 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 150 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Karl R. Price, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Marie B. Kraus, 2500 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D. C.

E. (9) \$4,000.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 319 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York City.

A. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, 304 Empire Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$1.25.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$937.50. E. (9) \$442.32.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., Room 607, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Cancer Society, New York, N. Y.; Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, New York; United Cerebral Palsy Associations, New York; National Multiple Sclerosis Society, N. Y., and National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders.

D. (6) \$12,250.01. E. (9) \$5,021.36.

A. Alex Radin, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Thomas M. Rayson, 1366 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier, Dallas, Tex.

B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.

D. (6) \$150.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Stanley Rector, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.

B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,490. E. (9) \$1,490.

A. Thomas E. Rhodes, 219 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Sigfried Olsen, 1 Drumm Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$799.99. E. (9) \$267.94

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$650.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the U. S., 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington D. C.

D. (6) \$58,269.20.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Room 906, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$2,965.46. E. (9) \$10,313.58.

A. Roland Rice, 618 Perpetual Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$280.

A. Theron Jennings Rice, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington D. C.

A. John J. Riggle.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$458.33.

A. George D. Riley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,122. E. (9) \$1,360.

A. John A. Riley, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. E. W. Rising, Suite 323, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Western Sugar Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$371.29.

A. William Neale Roach, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$117.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$250.

A. Frank L. Roberts, 1700 K Street NW., Suite 1306, Washington, D. C.

B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$100.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$37.45.

A. Frank W. Rogers, Suite 801, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$4,213.50.

A. Watson Rogers, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Food Brokers Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,000.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Roland H. Rowe, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$195. E. (9) \$163.28.

A. Horace Russell, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$437.50.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$454.30.

A. William H. Ryan, Room 303, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Room 303, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$2,250.27. E. (9) \$60.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 508 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$3,125. E. (9) \$78.36.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 508 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, Post Office Box 975, New Canaan, Conn.
E. (9) \$12.34.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Harrison Sasscer, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$322.80.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 460 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$375. E. (9) \$66.27.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,275.

A. Schoene and Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Railway Labor Executives Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) \$2.14.

A. Seaboard & Western Airlines, Inc., 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Harry See, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$575. E. (9) \$42.90.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$256.50. E. (9) \$64.35.

A. Donald H. Sharp, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$2,250.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$283.25.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Association of Port Authorities, Washington, D. C., and Airport Operators Council, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) \$137.50.

A. Laurence P. Sherry, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,250.

A. W. Lee Shield, 170 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$344.64. E. (9) \$60.08.

A. Richard C. Shipman.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$728. E. (9) \$78.78.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) \$2,750.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$625.

A. Leonard L. Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Women's and Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc., Atlanta, Ga.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$10,000. E. (9) \$3,040.52.

A. Stephen Slipper, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,625. E. (9) \$4.90.

A. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, Post Office Box 975, New Canaan, Conn.

E. (9) \$120.99.

A. Elizabeth A. Smart, 144 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) \$606.12. E. (9) \$160.16.

A. T. W. Smiley, Room 1150, La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.

B. Illinois Railroad Association, Room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$100.17.

A. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Edward Mallinckrodt, Jr., 16 West Moreland Place, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) \$7,206.46.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Standard Oil Company of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$3,660. E. (9) \$167.

A. James R. Smith, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) \$3,750.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.

D. (6) \$3,962.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$1,081.76.

A. J. D. Snyder, Room 1150, La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.

B. Illinois Railroad Association, Room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$825.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$59.19.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

D. (6) \$23,455.50. E. (9) \$24,328.25.

A. W. W. Spear, Fremont, Nebr.

B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$785.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$30.24. E. (9) \$40.23.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,800. E. (9) \$4,691.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$150.

A. Mrs. C. A. L. Stephens, P. O. Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D. C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Room 901, Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Room 901, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$240. E. (9) \$20.

A. Herman Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. B. H. Steuerwald, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Ampex Corp., Redwood City, Calif.

E. (9) \$0.30.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. N. R. Caine & Co., 40 Exchange Place, New York, N. Y.

E. (9) \$0.30.

A. Stevenson, Paul Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

E. (9) \$5.58.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.

B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$13,949.24. E. (9) \$12,285.05.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,450.

A. Erskine Stewart, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

E. (9) \$1.25.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,033.

A. W. S. Story, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$1.25.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Francis W. Stover, 610 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) \$1,625. E. (9) \$58.45.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Room 400, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,615.38.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Room 400, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Room 400, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$5,000.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.

B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 829 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$950. E. (9) \$135.93.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. E. Sturrock, Box 2084 Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.

B. Texas Water Conservation Association, Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.

D. (6) \$1,800. E. (9) \$1,484.03.

A. Joseph Monroe Sullivan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$226.48.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, Box 2084 Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.

D. (6) \$6,650. E. (9) \$8,575.91.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

B. Nevada Railroad Association, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

D. (6) \$350.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$1,828.75. E. (9) \$13.73.

A. Richard A. Tilden, 441 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. R. E. Schanz, Inc., 608-12 South Peters Street, New Orleans, La.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,125.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 2355 Alameda Street, Vallejo, Calif.

B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Solano County, Calif.

D. (6) \$295. E. (9) \$196.30.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$300.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Harry L. Towe, 241 Main Street, Hackensack, N. J.

B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, New York, N. Y.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$214.80.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$23.93.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$781.25.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. William S. Tyson, 736 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots, Post Office Box 601, Balboa, C. Z.

E. (9) \$79.43.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

E. (9) \$729.50.

A. United States Citizens' Association, Box 354, Balboa, C. Z.

D. (6) \$523.35. E. (9) \$1,885.27.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 211 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$10,879.37.

A. Vegetable Growers Association of America, 528 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago 1, Ill.

D. (6) \$38.15. E. (9) \$3.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$162.50. E. (9) \$1.05.

A. Woollen H. Walshe, 2800 Woodley Road NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Standard Oil Company of California, Suite 1204, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Charles A. Washer, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$625.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,989. E. (9) \$1,728.93.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, Room 1610, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. J. R. Watson, Room 1, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.

B. Mississippi Railroad Association, Room 1, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York City.

B. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.

D. (6) \$3,750.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Philco Corporation, Tloga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. William H. Webb, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,880.40. E. (9) \$333.56.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$52.56.

A. Wenchel, Schulman & Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Estate of Mary Clark deBrabant and Mrs. Katherine C. Williams, care of Rodnew W. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$51,570.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.

E. (9) \$625.

A. Gene T. West, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Munitions Carriers Conference, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert V. Westfall, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Montana Power Co., Electric Building, Butte, Mont.

E. (9) \$8.27.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.

E. (9) \$8.28.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Washington Water Power Co., Spokane, Wash.

E. (9) \$8.28.

A. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

E. (9) \$5,808.93.

A. Don White, Box 337, Fairfax, Va.

B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., Box 337, Fairfax, Va.

D. (6) \$3,249.99. E. (9) \$459.63.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$118.11.

A. Whiteford, Hart, Carmody & Wilson, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Humane Association.

D. (6) \$1,249.98. E. (9) \$281.94.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 Sixteenth NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Warren E. Whyte, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$80.15.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.

B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,887.24. E. (9) \$2,887.24.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, 2345 Ashmead Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Wind River Reservation, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

E. (9) \$3.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Klamath Indian Tribe, Klamath Agency, Oregon.

E. (9) \$261.34.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Reservation, Keshena, Wis.

E. (9) \$50.14.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Quinalt Indian Tribe, Taholah, Wash.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.

A. Franz O. Willenbacher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$2,100.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,200. E. (9) \$256.39.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,246.15.

A. John J. Wilson, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Whiteford, Hart, Carmody & Wilson, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,249.98. E. (9) \$281.94.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$129.50.

A. W. F. Wimberly, 873 Spring Street NW., Atlanta, Ga.

B. The Pure Oil Co., 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

D. (6) \$4,125. E. (9) \$258.43.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Frank G. Wollney, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Harley Z. Wooden.

B. The International Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$50.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 1828 Bank of the Southwest Building, Houston, Tex.

B. Angelina & Neches River RR Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.

D. (6) \$6,050.40. E. (9) \$907.02.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 1828 Bank of Southwest Building, Houston, Tex.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.

D. (6) \$20,724.77. E. (9) \$665.50.

A. Frank K. Wooley, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,662.50.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Robert D. Yeomans, West 2301 Pacific Ave., Spokane, Wash.

B. The Washington Water Power Co., Post Office Box 1445, Spokane, Wash.

A. Donald A. Young.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. Banks Young, Room 502, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$195.

A. O. David Zimring, 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the period from October 22, 1957, to January 20, 1958, inclusive.

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19-----

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

- (i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee," state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
- (ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" in answer to Item "B".
- (b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
 - (i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
 - (ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated,

☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◀

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◀

A. AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Association of American Medical Colleges, 2530 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

A. Donald Bartlett, Como, Miss.
B. National Beef Council, 406 West 34th, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Fleming Bomar, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Automobile Association.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Jay H. Cerf, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Foreign Policy Clearing House, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

A. Committee on Foreign Policy Legislation, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

A. Communities for Sustained Yield Units, c/o A. Roy Dunn, Title Insurance Building, Shelton, Wash.

A. Cooper & Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Advanced Life Underwriters, 708 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Josephus Daniels, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United World Federalists, Inc., 179 Allyn Street, Hartford, Conn.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Cerro De Pasco Corp., 300 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Robert J. Demichellis, 640 Central Avenue, Deerfield, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. Family Tax Association, 1616 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. John A. Flores, U. S. Grant Hotel, San Diego, Calif.
B. Curio Store Owners Association of the Tijuana Chamber of Commerce, Tijuana, Baja Calif.

A. Foreign Policy Clearing House, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

A. Gustave L. Goldstein, Citizens National Bank Building, 453 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Ronson Corp., 31 Fulton Street, Newark, N. J.

A. William H. Hedlund, 909 American Bank Building, Portland, Ore.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, San Francisco, Calif.; Tidewater Oil Co., San Francisco, Calif.; General Petroleum Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.; Shell Oil Co., San Francisco, Calif.; Union Oil Company of California, Los Angeles, Calif.; Richfield Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Willon A. Henderson, 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. General Petroleum Corp., 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Frieda B. Henneck, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Pierson, Bell & Dowd, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

A. John R. Holden, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. AMVETS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Edward D. Hollander, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Jaekle, Fleischmann, Kelly, Swart & Augspurger, 1800 Rand Building, Buffalo, N. Y.

B. Ann O. Kennedy, Nathan Oppenheimer, Jr., Helena S. Oppenheimer and the Marine Trust Company of Western New York as trustees under trust agreement with Helena W. Shire.

A. David A. James, Shelton, Wash.
B. Simpson Logging Co., Shelton, Wash.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.; Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn.; United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N. J.; Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky.; Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co., Cooley Clay Co., Kentucky Clay Mining Co., Mayfield, Ky.; Tennessee Absorbent Co., Southern Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.

A. A. W. Koehler, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Germaine Krettek, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. M. B. Lewis, Jr., Box 1517, Bluefield, W. Va.

B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, Suite 215, DeSales Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Retail Clerks International Association, DeSales Building, Washington, D. C.

A. George E. Long, 10 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Eugene R. Pickrell, 10 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Chicago Mercantile Exchange, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. D. McElvain, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

A. Martin & Burt, Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Bowaters Southern Paper Corp., Calhoun, Tenn.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Safe Harbor Water Power Corp., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. John Minnoch, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, 536 First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.

A. National Beef Council, 406 West 34th Street, Kansas City, Mo.

A. National Onion Association, Jackson, Mich.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Lineas Tres M., Vallarta 1, Mexico 4, D. F.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Philippine-American War Damage Claimants, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Philippine Sugar Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Ohio Coal Association, 209 Hoge Building, St. Clairsville, Ohio.

A. Perry S. Patterson, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers Association, 1603 Orington Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. Family Tax Association, 1616 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Eugene R. Pickrell, 10 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. True Temper Corp., 1623 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio, et al.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Detroit Bakery Employers' Council, 2901 Grand River Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Association of American Medical Colleges, 2530 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

A. Joseph H. Ream, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. William T. Reed, Hill Building, 17th and I Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Louis H. Renfrow, 1000 Connecticut Avenue Office Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Amherst Coal Co., Charleston, W. Va., et al.

A. Ed D. Schorr, 33 North High Street, Columbus, Ohio.

B. The Ohio Coal Association, 209 Hoge Building, St. Clairsville, Ohio.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Association of American Railroads, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Harry L. Tepper, 31 Fulton Street, Newark, N. J.

B. Ronson Corp., 31 Fulton Street, Newark, N. J.

A. William B. Thompson, Jr., 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. J. T. Trullinger, National Bank of Commerce Building, Olympia, Wash.
B. General Petroleum Corp., 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif., et al.

A. Albert E. Wilkinson, 417 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 616 Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, at Union Junior College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on last Sunday my colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], delivered a speech at the dedication of a new building for the Union Junior College, in Cranford, N. J. His address emphasized the importance of the junior colleges and the need to maintain and strengthen their contributions to the American system of education. Because I believe his remarks merit wide attention, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CASE OF NEW JERSEY AT THE DEDICATION OF A NEW BUILDING FOR THE UNION JUNIOR COLLEGE, AT CRANFORD, N. J., ON SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1958

For high-school seniors, their mothers, their fathers, their ministers, yes, even their Senators, the anxious season is fast approaching. This is the period when the dread notices start arriving from college admissions officers with the bad news, "Sorry, we cannot accept your application for admission." At many homes, the postman will be ringing twice, three times and even more with this news since the high-school senior of today has found it prudent to apply to many institutions in the hopes that one will fall into loving hands. As the rejection slips mount, there is disappointment and sometimes despair. The rejected student and his family have no doubt that there is a shortage in college facilities.

The unhappy facts about today's situation is that our high-school classes are bigger and bigger, the desire of high-school students for college training is steadily mounting and college capacity cannot keep up with the growth. As one youngster has put it, as things stand now, "You can't go to college where your parents went; they want better people." The keeper of the admissions door at one New Jersey university indicates the future looks worse, rather than better. He says, "the great crime is that we soon must start saying 'No' to kids whom today we accept."

Now if the medical profession of our Nation were to begin warning today that some new disease had been discovered which would handicap thousands and thousands of youngsters, there is no doubt that the citizenry would spring to action and mobilize all possible resources to meet such a peril. In my judgment, the shortage of college facilities, and the shortage of competent, dedicated teachers represents an equal threat to the young men and women whose future we so cherish. A lack of a college education for the qualified youngster is a lasting blight on his growth.

The Director of the National Science Foundation, Dr. Alan T. Waterman, said that while this Nation has no positive measure of the losses incurred to our country's progress, we do know that statistically only about 50 percent of high-school graduates who are judged capable of receiving college training go on to college. And he adds, with an eye to the current headlines, we know that many potentially able scientists and engineers, as well as leaders in other fields, are lost as a result of the failure of this 50 percent to receive advanced training. This loss, I might add, will never be recouped. The youngster whose talents go undeveloped is a loss to his Nation's progress forever.

The situation looks bad now, but a look around the corner is an even greater shock to our complacent assumption that we have the best educational system in the world. President Eisenhower's Committee on Education Beyond the High School has warned:

"Our colleges and universities are expected by the American public to perform something close to a miracle in the next 10 to 15 years. They are called upon to provide education of a continually improving quality to a far larger number of students—at least 6 million by 1970, compared to 3 million now. . . . Our institutions of higher learning, despite their remarkable achievements in the past, are in no shape today to meet the challenge. Their resources are already strained; their quality standards are even now in jeopardy; and their projected plans fall far short of the indicated need."

There are those who suggest that in the light of this, the best course for us to follow, in effect, is to teach the best and shoot the rest. The restriction of education to an elite group is completely contrary to our democratic tradition; in fact, to the effective functioning of a democracy. But the task of expanding our facilities for higher education and at the same time maintaining the quality is not an easy one. Individuals, corporations, citizen groups, municipal, State, and Federal forces—each has a role to play. I emphasize this diversity of interest so that no one will feel that because I am a part of the Federal Government I believe that the problem should be placed entirely or permanently in Uncle Sam's hands. I do believe that it is important to keep the essential responsibility for education in the hands of States and local communities and private organizations, with the Federal Government assuming a role of leadership and stimulus in those areas of greatest need.

The very institution whose new campus we dedicate today, Union Junior College, is a fine example of the teamwork I have urged.

In 1933 this was the first junior college in the United States to be established with Federal funds. The first classes were at night with 243 persons enrolled. And in 1936, when Federal funds were withdrawn, it became a private institution, growing through the years to a student body of more than 600.

The facilities we are here to dedicate today will double the present educational plant, and as your president, Dr. MacKay, has said, "The new building will be tangible evidence of what Union Junior College is doing to cope with the tremendous problem of swelling college enrollments. It will help to assure that the Union County area

will find itself adequately prepared with college facilities."

As a Union County resident—and one with a son who will be seeking admission to college in a few years—I congratulate you all on the hard work and great devotion which you have given to make this accomplishment possible. This is a proud day for Union County.

The theme which you have chosen for the meetings of this week, Giving New Jersey Youth the Chance to Go to College, is indeed an appropriate one. The New Jersey State Department of Education has estimated that at least half and possibly 55 percent of our high-school seniors want to go on to college, but not all of these find it possible to do so. Another New Jersey report indicates that in 1956, 35 percent of the graduates of all New Jersey secondary schools went on to college. The disparity—and I recognize it is difficult to measure it exactly—is our challenge and our opportunity.

Nationally, the situation is no better. Secretary Folsom has warned that among those who graduate in the upper fourth of their high-school senior class, more than 1 out of 3 do not go on to college. Altogether, in round numbers, about 200,000 of these ablest students now stop their education below the college level.

In studying how the Federal Government could most effectively help remedy this educational deficit, I have become increasingly interested in the potentiality of the junior college, or the community college, as it is known in some localities.

Last year I introduced legislation to provide emergency Federal assistance to interested States to help establish public community colleges. Such colleges, as you well know, can provide youngsters with the first 2 years of a liberal arts education or 2 years of terminal training in technical and semi-professional fields. They can do this at a low cost and close to people's homes. I have been informed that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will consider my bill in the course of its current hearings on educational legislation.

As many of you know, the members of both President Truman's and President Eisenhower's commissions on higher education gave these 2-year institutions a very hearty endorsement. Numerous respected educators have seconded this, particularly Dr. James Bryant Conant. The former president of Harvard University commented that there would be no inconsistency with our educational ideals if local, 2-year colleges were to enroll as many as half of the boys and girls who wish to engage in formal studies beyond high school. A national organization founded by businessmen, the Council for Financial Aid to Education, also sings the praises of the junior college, emphasizing that it offers a means to make the educational dollar go far.

There is particular need for public and private junior colleges in the light of our new emphasis on higher education and especially science and technology. President Eisenhower's Committee on Scientists and Engineers, in urging development of junior or community colleges, pointed out that there is great need for men and women with at least 2 years of college preparation: "Members of the President's Committee are unanimous in the belief that the shortage of technicians is at least as severe as the shortage

of scientists and engineers, and that their lack contributes materially to the underutilization of scientists and engineers." The Committee report said "we are now graduating less than one-sixth the required number of highly skilled scientific and engineering technicians."

But, let me add quickly, I do not suggest that our colleges—2-year or 4-year—should concentrate only on scientific and technological education. I agree with the president of the College of the City of New York, Dr. Buell G. Gallagher, that it would be disastrous to turn out from our schools and colleges technicians who are ignorant of the arts and innocent of the humane studies. We must have both, not one or the other.

While we are all concerned about sufficient quantity of college education, we should make sure that this is not achieved at a cost of reduction in quality. And this is hard to determine. While one can easily tell the difference between a good building and a bad one, it is much harder to tell the difference between a good education and a bad one. Evidence of this is that the best-known colleges are not necessarily the best ones. Nor are the colleges with the most courses the best places in which to develop the best scholars.

Many junior colleges, since they are relatively new institutions, have a fine opportunity to set and maintain high standards. Junior colleges are to many Americans a new idea. They will prosper as they demonstrate that their product is a first-class education. Today's dedication is clear evidence that Union Junior College is in this category.

The Natural Gas Users' Interest Should Come First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, up until now informed observers have all figured the Democrat leadership had legislation to amend the Natural Gas Act scheduled for early House consideration. Now on account of the wording of a Texas \$100-a-plate dinner invitation there are indications of a postponement.

But now, or later, the issue of control and price regulation has to be settled and Members of Congress have the responsibility of letting the users of natural gas know where they stand.

In reexamining and discussing this issue, Mr. Speaker, let me say no one as far as I know, in or out of a political campaign, ever accused me of not voting originally according to honest conviction. Nor was it ever a burning issue in my State of Washington or in my Congressional district. While we do now, in 1954 we did not have natural gas, and actually today our source of gas is Canada, where control of the price at the wellhead by the Federal Power Commission is not involved.

But to revert to the previous debate on this legislation, support of the bill seemed logical at that time—especially from one like myself who is inclined to prefer local

State regulation close to the consumer and people affected rather than control at the national level; and the argument seemed reasonable also in that the bill was reinstating a condition which without widespread public complaint had existed for 16 years until the Supreme Court reversed the situation and decided local producers did come under the act.

Everyone seemed to agree, too, that the Congress originally had not intended this and, furthermore, the House debate seemed to establish that enactment of the bill would stimulate wildcat drilling and thus create a greater national supply to fill the existing and projected shortage.

Anyway, I voted as I saw the situation—even if later I had misgivings when the bill came in for bitter and, at one point, unsavory mention during debate in the other body. I should say also, Mr. Speaker, as I stated publicly at that time, I approved when President Eisenhower vetoed the gas bill; it certainly seemed that public confidence in the so-called gas lobby was shaken and, as for myself, I resolved to restudy the entire issue when similar legislation came up again.

Now I am convinced, in contradiction of previous arguments, my reasoning was faulty in several respects. Take the factor of increasing incentive to wildcat and to risk money in drilling and locating more gas. Experience indicates there is plenty of incentive as things are to encourage such drilling—especially on account of special tax treatment and depletion allowances. But where I think I made my error in assessing the facts was in failing to recognize that once a pipeline is built and tied into a gas field there is little left in the way of competition and the producer of gas has a virtual monopoly. Thus, the ultimate natural-gas consumer, regardless of regulation of the transportation utility or the local distributor, is at the mercy of the producer when a contract comes up for extension.

In observing the petroleum industry, I have had increasing suspicion that the law of supply and demand does not always function freely. Heating-oil prices in my Congressional district are a case in point, where increased source of oil into the area by a new pipeline from Canada did not prevent fuel-oil prices from steadily advancing. Federal regulation to protect the public may be needed in both cases.

Anyway, I fear where the location of natural-gas intakes and outlets are fixed by an exclusive franchise, as with pipelines, there is no free market either at the buying end or the selling end. Thus, in this situation I am now of the opinion that the public interest requires regulation by the Federal Power Commission of all parties concerned with natural gas, including the producer.

Therefore, I am constrained to say, Mr. Speaker, that the passage of the proposed natural-gas bill does not recommend itself to me and, accordingly, I shall oppose the legislation when it comes before us again. In all conscience, on reexamination of the facts, that is the only course which seems right to me and fair to 20 million users of natural gas throughout the Nation.

Proposal To End Treatment Plant Construction Program Imperils Nation's Battle Against Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, although we seldom think of it as such, one of the Nation's most precious natural resources is water. Once taken for granted—just as the air we breathe—the importance of water has recently taken on greater and greater proportions. And for good reason, when you consider that safe water and enough of it are fundamental elements, inseparable and indispensable to the health and well-being of man.

The absolute necessity for an effective water conservation and utilization program becomes apparent when you take into consideration the fact that while the demand for water constantly increases, the supply of water remains constant. Mr. Speaker, there is as much water available to us today in this country as there was available to the Pilgrims when they landed in 1620. And yet the demand for it has increased to amazing proportions.

IMPORTANCE OF WATER

Water is the most used raw material in our factories. The fast growing synthetic and chemical industries require tremendous amounts of good water. The steel industry alone uses 13 billion gallons a day. It takes 365,000 gallons to produce a ton of rayon yarn; about one-half million gallons for 1,000 yards of woolen cloth; more than a million gallons for a thousand barrels of aviation gasoline.

Industry, it is apparent, requires water—tons of it. Of the total water use in the Nation in 1950, 35 percent was by industry. The forecast for 1975 is 62 percent or 215 billion gallons per day. With the growth of industrial production and population, a paradox will be presented to industry: How to use less water while needing more. The requirement for a lesser use is developing from the necessity to assure the municipalities, agriculture, and other users as well as industry obtain their needed share.

Take municipalities for instance. By 1975, our present population is expected to increase by 37 million people, 90 percent of whom will locate in communities or urban areas. Water supply consumption will increase from 15 to 25 billion gallons per day for domestic use.

Take the increased use of water for agriculture, especially irrigation. In 1900 we were irrigating 7.7 million acres which required 20 billion gallons of water each day. In 1955 we were irrigating almost 4 times as much land—29.5 million acres. Yet we used 6 times more water—120 billion gallons each day. By 1975 we will be irrigating 37.4 million

acres requiring 170 billion gallons of water a day.

Add to all this the increased recreational use of water and the increase in waste transportation and you arrive at the startling conclusion that by 1975 this country will require an increase in the current water supply of 145 percent—equal to the additional supply of 145 New York cities, requiring the flow of about 11 Colorado Rivers.

This spells nothing but trouble because of the simple fact that while the demand for water increases daily the supply remains constant. According to a recent study made by the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, there is little reason to expect any marked change in our gross resource of water by 1980. In other words, we'll have as much then as we have now—but with a demand increase equal to the flow of 11 Colorado Rivers.

This report goes on to say that:

Although there are now several promising techniques in the research and development stage, such as desalting of sea waters, reduction in evaporation losses, induced rainfall, and other reduction of water losses, none of these can be depended upon to change the overall supply of water in the near future.

Next to the very air we breathe, I would say water is most important to human life. It is also essential to economic and industrial progress. It is also essential to our entire defense structures.

As Secretary of the Army Brucker recently said: "The United States can no longer treat water as an inexhaustible resource and allow it to run a wayward and wasteful course to the sea." But that is exactly what we are doing today in our polluted rivers and streams.

Pollution is a waste of water and unless we tackle this water-pollution problem, and tackle it hard, we are going to be in very serious trouble in a few short years. Pollution is one of the largest contributors to our present and future water-resources problems and we must recognize that its control is one of the most effective and economical water conservation measures available to us.

POLLUTION PROBLEM SERIOUS

The pollution problem has gone from bad to worse in the past few years.

In 1920, 48 million people were served by sewers, and wastes had a population equivalent of 42 million persons. Today 95 million are served by sewers, and wastes have a population equivalent of 55 million persons. By 1975 an estimated 160 million persons will be served by sewers, with wastes having a population equivalent depending on what we do about pollution in the interim. And what has been our progress in supplying facilities for the treatment of these wastes? Right now, there is a need for 9,255 municipal treatment projects.

The picture is even darker regarding industrial waste. In 1920 organic wastes discharged by industry had a population equivalent of 50 million persons. Today that is more than doubled. Organic wastes discharged by industry has a population equivalent today of 110 million persons. By 1975 we know that our present industrial capacity will be doubled. The amount of pollution

will again depend largely on what we do today and in the years to come in the field of pollution control. A 1955 survey by the Public Health Service shows a total of 5,700 treatment projects needed by industry.

And what about the future? In the Army college study I referred to before, the demand-supply situation was broken down region by region. Listen to some of the conclusions regarding the problem in 1980:

New England region. Pollution abatement is needed in certain areas, especially in southern New England.

Delaware-Hudson region. Serious water problems seem to be inevitable for area.

Chesapeake region. Pollution abatement is a growing problem in this area.

Eastern Great Lakes-St. Lawrence region. Pollution control is absolutely essential to protect the Great Lakes supply.

Upper Mississippi region. Pollution abatement is also a must for this area.

And the report goes on, covering each area of the country, each time with the same conclusion—pollution problems will become increasingly serious.

Fortunately for us, pollution can be controlled. Pollution is not something that must be endured as an inevitable consequence of our urban and industrial growth. Pollution abatement is possible, but it is an expensive process and it requires the cooperation of government, at every level, industry, and the public itself.

Responsibility for pollution abatement for the protection of water resources is shared today by local, State and Federal agencies. Under the American tradition of community responsibility, each city and industry has a clear obligation to construct, operate and maintain all the pollution abatement works necessary to assure that its wastes will not cause harm to others.

FEDERAL POLLUTION CONTROL RESPONSIBILITY AND ACTIVITY

The Federal responsibilities are primarily of a supporting nature, designed to assist and strengthen State programs. They include research, technical assistance on particularly difficult problems requiring highly specialized personnel or other resources not always available to individual State agencies, promotion of coordinated interstate action, and enforcement on interstate pollution problems. Since 1956 Federal responsibilities include Federal grants in aid, amounting to \$50 million a year, to assist local communities in the construction of sewage treatment plants and facilities. I was the original sponsor and author of that program and am happy to report that it is working out splendidly.

As of January 31, 1958, Mr. Speaker, \$72,543,846.36 in Federal grants have been approved for 875 projects representing a total cost of \$367,064,915. In addition, Public Health Service regional offices are now processing 245 additional projects representing a total cost of \$136,369,970 of which \$23,939,912 would represent Federal grants. State agencies, at the same time, are processing 392 other projects which will cost \$458,715,818, of which \$42,808,783 would represent Federal grants.

This is a fine record for a program that supposedly did not have a chance. But we find, that despite the need for this program and despite its successful operation, it is being attacked from many sides.

Of course, this is nothing new. Every effort has been made since the enactment of Public Law 660 to block appropriations for the grant program. The first year the Bureau of the Budget froze the funds for 3 months. Last year an attempt was made to kill the appropriation on the floor of the House. We stopped that—but only by a narrow margin.

Now it looks like we have got a new gimmick to contend with—a completely new and cleverly appealing scheme for torpedoing this most vitally needed Federal function. This time, apparently, it is to be done under the alluring mantles of economy and States rights.

JOINT FEDERAL-STATE ACTION COMMITTEE

Last August the President suggested the formation of a committee to study the question of Federal aid to the States with a view to determining which of the present grant programs could be properly turned over to the States and the Federal participation ended. This group, known as the Joint Federal-State Action Committee, issued its first progress report on December 5, 1957, and in it recommended that Federal grants for sewage treatment plant facilities be ended. This recommendation together with certain others will be considered by the governors' conference to be held next May. It has not yet been approved by that conference.

Apparently this does not make any difference to the President because in his fiscal 1959 budget we find the following language regarding the grant program under Public Law 660:

While this budget recommends continuation of this program at the 1958 level, it is expected that by the end of 1959 the Federal Government and the States will have had an opportunity to act on the recommendation of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee that the States assume this function entirely. Therefore, it is anticipated that no funds will be included in the 1960 budget for this purpose, should this recommendation be accepted as practicable by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in considering the practicability of this recommendation the Congress should pay close heed to the bases of the recommendation. Let us examine the joint committee's findings, the evidence presented, and see if the President's anticipation is justified.

The joint committee's first finding, found on page 35 of the report, was that municipalities and private industry, except in certain emergency periods, have borne virtually the full costs of waste-treatment construction projects, and outlays for such purposes have grown significantly.

The first part of this finding is so obvious it could have gone without saying. The second is misleading.

Naturally, prior to the time the Federal Government enters into a particular field or activity, local governments and interests have the entire responsibility. The important question is what

has been the result of municipalities and private industry bearing virtually the full cost of waste-treatment construction projects? The result, simply, Mr. Speaker, has been the accumulation of a tremendous backlog of needs in sewage-treatment works construction.

As of January 1955, the Public Health Service estimated that the cost of municipal pollution-abatement needs for

1955-56 was \$3.49 billion for sewage-treatment plants and \$1.84 billion for interceptors. This makes a total of \$5.33 billion for the next 10 years. These figures include the cost of building for the backlog, replacement for obsolescence, and construction for increased population. The table below shows these figures in greater detail:

Estimated cost of municipal pollution abatement needs (sewage treatment plants and interceptors), 1955-65

Item	Description	Cost for 10-year period 1955-65 (billions 1954 dollars)		
		Sewage treatment plants	Inter- ceptors	Total
Backlog of needs as of Jan. 1, 1955.	1. Communities needing treatment facilities including places with sewer systems requiring both sewers and treatment (22.7 million population).	1.03	0.60	1.63
	2. Communities served by facilities requiring replacement (2.1 million population).	.11	.03	.14
	3. Communities served by facilities requiring enlargement, addition, or improvement (13.7 million population).	.07	-----	.07
	4. Communities with needs, but type of improvement undetermined (1.6 million population).	.04	.02	.06
	Total backlog of needs.....	1.25 1.24	.65 .48	1.90 1.72
Obsolescence, 1955-65.				
New requirements, 1955-65.	1. Increased needs in presently sewered areas (17.3 million population).	.89	.67	1.56
	2. Needs in communities having no sewers or treatment in 1955 but which will develop need in next 10 years (1.6 million population).	.11	.04	.15
	Total requirements.....	1.00	.71	1.71
	Total cost of municipal pollution abatement needs, 1955-65.	3.49	1.84	5.33

The chart shows that despite every effort made by local communities, who are generally genuinely sincere in their efforts to clean up their water supply, they have fallen further and further behind until today, according to latest available figures, the total backlog of sewage-treatment plant needs alone amounts to almost \$2 billion. Add to that obsolescence and new requirements and you have a total 10-year need of \$5,330,000,000.

To meet this need, therefore, the local communities will have to spend at the rate of \$533 million a year for the next 10 years. They have never come close to spending this amount. The average yearly expenditure for treatment-plant construction, going back as far as 1913, has been \$180 million. And that is in terms of 1955 dollars. Only once, and that was during the PWA-WPA days, did construction keep pace with need—and that only because Federal grants were available.

The claim of the joint committee, Mr. Speaker, that treatment-plant construction outlays have grown significantly in recent years also requires examination. According to the joint committee, the annual dollar volume of waste-treatment construction in recent years is as follows:

	Millions
1952.....	\$176
1953.....	238
1954.....	282
1955.....	249
1956.....	393
1957 (estimated).....	475

These amounts, Mr. Speaker, were arrived at by taking the total of sewage-treatment works contract awards and raising it by 25 percent. I was unable

to find anywhere in the report why the total was raised 25 percent, but I am sure the joint committee had some reason to do it. For the record, however, I would like to show the actual total of sewage-treatment works contract awards for the same years as compiled by the Public Health Service, which administers this grant program. The actual totals are as follows:

	Millions
1952.....	\$137
1953.....	190
1954.....	228
1955.....	201
1956.....	354
1957 (estimated).....	329

An examination of either table, Mr. Speaker, shows that despite increases in plant construction outlay still enough is not being done and we are continually falling behind. It is the joint committee's contention, however, that the trend toward greater expenditures and stimulation in this field began before the enactment of the grant provision in Public Law 660 and, therefore, there is no real need for the program.

Mr. Speaker, the joint committee is either trying to deceive us or is just plain ignorant of certain facts. Included in the 1956 dollar volume of treatment-plant outlays, Mr. Speaker, is a \$78-million project completed in that year, after being under study and development for the past 30 years, in the Pittsburgh metropolitan area. A project like the Pittsburgh plant comes along once every 10 to 20 years, but this joint committee includes it to show an increase in treatment-plant construction. If not for the Pittsburgh project expenditures during

1956 would have been below the \$300 million mark by over \$25 million.

So to begin with the joint committee is basing its trend on a project that comes along once every 10 to 20 years. Moreover, the committee fails to point out in its report that the rather substantial increase in treatment-plant construction for 1957 was the result of Federal stimulation under Public Law 660. Which-ever table you follow, the joint committee's or the Public Health Service's, it is apparent that during 1957, the first year of operation under the Federal treatment-plant-construction program, more contract awards for treatment-plant construction were let than in any single year in our history. From the committee's own figures we actually have the best single argument for the continuation of Federal assistance that I have ever seen. Moreover, the increased activity for 1957 was a result of Federal stimulation amounting to less than \$20 million. The entire \$50 million appropriated was not spent that year. This tremendous jump in 1957 was the direct effect of the Federal program.

I think the question whether this Federal program is helpful was answered in the December 1957 issue of Minnesota Municipalities, as follows:

The fact is that the existing grant-in-aid program has been a great success. Except during PWA days and the period during which the present aid program has been in effect, municipalities have never constructed enough sewage-treatment plans to adequately handle their increasing needs.

Under the present program, while Federal grants accounted for only an estimated 10 to 12 percent of the total construction outlays in fiscal 1957, the Federal program has in effect generated the greatest sewage plant construction program in the history of the Nation.

Although the aid offered by the Federal Government has been relatively small, the program has served to move many crucial local projects off dead center and has, as a result, broken the bottlenecks to a more widespread program by getting small upstream municipalities to initiate control programs.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the trend is definitely toward greatly expanded treatment-plant construction activity, but only because the Federal Government finally assumed its share of the responsibility for cleaning up our rivers and streams. To reach any other conclusion would be inconsistent with the facts, including the very facts presented by the joint committee.

STATE PROGRAMS EXPAND UNDER FEDERAL AID

Now let us turn to the second finding, which is: State governments have been active in this field for many years, mainly to plan and coordinate statewide pollution control work. This, again, is a well-known fact and tribute should be paid to the Nation's public health officers and State pollution control activity officials who have devoted so much of their time and effort to what is more often than not a thankless task. I worked closely with these State people during the writing of what is now Public Law 660. I know how active they have been and I know the handicaps under which they have been forced to work in the past.

Originally, Mr. Speaker, the administration asked for \$2 million yearly Federal grants over a 5-year period to assist the States in expanding and operating their water pollution control programs. A conference of State health officers held here in Washington agreed that \$2 million was inadequate for Federal assistance to 53 State and Territorial water pollution control agencies plus several interstate agencies to carry out effectively the purposes of the bill. So the executive committee of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers urged that the amount be increased to \$5 million, and that amount was approved by the House. In conference it was cut to \$3 million which is now in the law.

These Federal grants are needed to stimulate State activity in the pollution-control field. Federal program grants under section 5 of Public Law 660 accelerate not only State programs but State financial support as well. Experience under the original Pollution Control Act, Public Law 845 of the 80th Congress, proves this point conclusively.

State water pollution control program expenditures (with breakdown as to source of funds)

Year	Total	State funds	Federal grant
1950	3,088,097	2,286,941	845,519
1951	3,709,805	2,993,322	815,313
1952	4,785,514	4,016,580	768,934
1953	3,912,404	3,912,404	0
1954	3,989,257	3,989,257	0
1955	14,000,000	14,000,000	0
1956	14,000,000	14,000,000	0

¹ Estimated.

It is obvious what happened under the old law. From 1950 to 1952, when Federal program grants, as distinguished from construction grants, were available, State expenditures showed a definite increase. Then, from 1953 on, when the Federal grants were discontinued, State activity remained static at the plateau reached in 1952, the last year of Federal grants. The Federal stimulant and incentive was taken away, and State activity, which had been on a steady rise, leveled off.

With the enactment of Public Law 660 in 1956 the increase in State activity began again. Although actual expenditures are not yet available, budgeted figures show that in 1957 the total spent on State pollution control programs was \$6,926,739, of which the Federal Government contributed \$1,937,107 and the States \$4,989,632—almost \$1 million more than they are estimated to have spent the year before and for the 3 preceding years before that. In 1958 it is predicted that a total of \$8,331,243 will be spent by State pollution control agencies. Of this amount \$5,531,232 will be purely State funds, with the Federal Government contributing the balance of \$2,799,123. Again, over a million and a half dollars increase in State activity as a direct result of the Federal grant program which has served as a stimulant to the States to accelerate their own programs.

These State programs are the backbone of any really effective pollution control program. As former Assistant Sec-

retary of Health, Education, and Welfare Roswell Perkins said before our subcommittee:

In the final analysis, pollution control is achieved through State action to bring about construction of needed treatment works. For this reason, it is essential that the States be adequately equipped to do the job. In recent years, the rapid increase and concentration of industry, and the continuing growth of urban areas, have thrust enormous pollution problems on many States. Some States have expanded their programs to meet the growing problem. On the other hand, many State water pollution control agencies are inadequately supported. For example, in 32 States annual appropriations for water pollution control in 1954-55 were less than \$50,000; 23 of these States provided less than \$30,000 a year.

The inadequacy of the support of water pollution control activities is particularly significant in those States now experiencing large-scale industrial expansion, with the attendant urban development. The type of assistance provided for in these bills would be especially important to these States.

Rounding out our assistance to State programs is the provision of expert consulting assistance on complex problems due to new types of pollution. The central staff of consultants at our Taft center is available to assist all the States on problems, which although they occur throughout the country, do not occur frequently in any one State.

Thus, the second finding of the joint committee, Mr. Speaker, told us nothing we did not already know, while leaving out the all important fact that Federal financial assistance has a definite and accelerating effect on State pollution-control activities.

STATE FINANCIAL AIDS INADEQUATE

The third finding of the committee is that some State governments provide financial incentives to municipalities and industry for waste treatment projects. It lists 11, altogether: California, Maine, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Vermont.

An examination of these State grant programs shows:

First. The programs in Maine and Maryland were directly stimulated by enactment of Public Law 660 and are predicated on the existence of that act.

Second. In addition to the programs in Maine and Maryland, the programs in New Hampshire, New Mexico, Ohio, and Vermont were all enacted after the passage of Public Law 660.

Third. Most of the programs provide exceedingly small amounts of money making their effectiveness questionable. The California program, for instance, providing a \$1 million fund for loans pales to insignificance when you consider that last year total contract awards for treatment plants in the State amounted to close to \$60 million. In New Mexico the legislature appropriated \$150,000 for 2 years. Last year New Mexico was spending at the rate of over \$1 million for treatment plant construction. While there are all worthy and commendable programs, and the States inaugurating them should be praised, they are not nearly enough to get the job done even in the State involved much less considering the fact that the great and overwhelming majority of States have no such program at all.

A few States, Mr. Speaker, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Virginia, and Wisconsin, have enacted legislation providing financial assistance to industries for waste treatment construction. These acts provide merely for accelerated amortization for tax purposes of industrial treatment facilities or they exempt industrial treatment facilities from local taxation. They are few in number and limited in scope.

It is perfectly obvious that while some States do provide financial assistance to their communities and industries, the overwhelming majority of them make no provision for such assistance and for all intents and purposes, the financial responsibility for constructing treatment plants, without Federal aid, rests squarely on the hard-pressed cities and towns throughout the country.

MEANINGLESS FINDINGS DO NOT JUSTIFY CONCLUSIONS

The joint committee's fourth finding is that the Public Health Service provides technical assistance to State and interstate agencies, and through them on request to communities and industries. To which I say only, "They had better be." That is what the law tells them to do, and if the Public Health Service were not doing what this joint committee found it was doing then an investigation of some sort would be in order. Mr. Speaker, of what significance is this fourth finding? How in the world can a finding that a Federal agency is doing what the law directs it to do lead to the conclusion and holding that Federal assistance to the communities for treatment plant construction should be discontinued?

The meaningless nature of the findings carry over to the fifth, as well. Almost as if they were making some sort of discovery, the joint committee finds that beginning in fiscal 1957, Federal grants were made to local governments to aid in municipal sewage treatment plant construction, a field previously reserved primarily to State and local government.

I wonder which definition of "find" fits this finding. According to Webster, to find is defined, first, to meet with, or light upon, accidentally; hence to fall in with, as a person; or, second, to come upon by seeking or by effort. I do not know how much effort or seeking it took to find out that since fiscal 1957 there has been a Federal grant program to assist communities in the construction of municipal treatment plants. But I know for sure that the joint committee did not light upon that fact accidentally because that is the program they were after in the first place.

But to call this a finding does a disservice to the word itself. Upon finding it to exist, this joint committee recommends that the construction program under Public Law 660 be eliminated. That is about the extent of it. They had to find that it existed before they could recommend its discontinuance and that is the reason, it seems, for the fifth finding.

SIXTH FINDING GOOD ARGUMENT FOR CONTINUATION OF GRANTS

Going to the sixth finding, we find a further example of how the committee

states a fact as a finding, trying to leave the implication, at least, that this is a reason for discontinuing the grant program. The sixth finding, however, might backfire on them. Actually, it is a good argument for the program—not against it. The finding is that Federal grants will account for an estimated 10 to 12 percent of total construction outlays in 1958; this percentage will decline as local governments increase their construction programs to meet growing waste-treatment requirements in the years ahead.

To the committee this is a finding to justify the repeal of the program. To me it is an argument for its continuation.

It is true that Federal grants account for only about 10 to 12 percent of the total treatment-plant-construction outlay and that this percentage will decline as local governments increase their construction programs. This finding, that the Federal share is so small, leads to the seventh finding which is that the States can, therefore, absorb the cost. But we will get to that later. First, let us see why the Federal share is only 10 or 12 percent and why it will decline with increased local expenditures.

Under the existing program \$50 million a year is made available to the local communities. The grants are limited to 30 percent of the cost of the project or \$250,000, whichever is smaller. When a large and expensive project is approved for a \$250,000 grant, the ratio of the Federal contribution to the local outlay is bound to be reduced. Many of these projects cost well over a million, and some much more.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, the percentage of Federal participation has been low. But, the important thing to remember is that this low percentage of Federal participation has stimulated tremendous local participation. When we build interstate highways at a 90-10 Federal-local ratio nobody complains. But when it comes to investing in clean water at an unbelievably favorable 10-90 Federal-local ratio, it is called an unwise program. Where else does the Federal Government get such a good return on its grant dollar? Considering only the projects constructed under the program itself the ratio is running about 5 to 1—local over Federal. And for the overall construction program containing projects both with and without Federal aid the ratio is 9 to 1—local over Federal. What better return for our investment could we ask?

The fact that the percentage of the Federal grant to the total national outlay will decline as local outlays increase is as obvious as the nose on a fourth-grade math student's face. With a constant Federal share, as dictated by law, and an ever-increasing local participation stimulated by that Federal share, the percentage of such Federal share must decrease. The fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal percentage will decrease is not a reason to scrap the program but to continue it on as a good investment. This rather interesting finding No. 6 is one of the best arguments I have seen in favor of the continuation

of the Federal-grant program under Public Law 660.

FEDERAL PROGRAM SHOULD BE INCREASED, NOT CUT

Now we come to the seventh, and final, finding of the joint committee. This committee found that the Federal sewage-treatment plant construction grants are relatively small in terms of costs of needed projects and could easily be absorbed by the States. The first part of the sentence is exactly what I have been saying ever since we enacted Public Law 660. My original proposal called for twice what is now contained in the law, but we had to settle for the existing program due to incessant opposition from the administration and certain other forces. Time and time again I have said, "Fifty million is not enough. We need at least \$100 million a year for 10 years to do the job right." I am happy the committee agrees that \$50 million a year for 10 years is a relatively small amount. But we part company there. Because it is small, says the committee, we can get rid of it. That is a rather interesting way of looking at things. The way I see it, if the amount is small and the needs large the answer is to increase the amount. The logic of the committee's approach escapes me. It reminds me of a man with 6 children but money enough to feed only 3. Following the committee's logic, his solution is to let them all starve.

The second part of the finding does not seem to jibe with the facts. We are asked to believe that since the Federal grants are so small they could readily be absorbed by the States. "Readily" is an interesting word. Here it is 1958 already and only 11 States have grant programs of their own. Most of these are of rather recent origin and two of them are directly tied to the Federal grant program. I might say with the exception of Pennsylvania the only effective State financial aid programs are predicated on the Federal aid provided for in Public Law 660.

To say now, after less than 2 years of experience under the act, that the States will readily absorb the Federal contribution overlooks the fact that the reason we enacted section 6 in the first place is the fact that through the years the States have not assumed their responsibilities in this field and therefore the Congress was obliged to take action to preserve a vital and precious natural resource—water.

Wishing will not make it so. Nor will merely saying the States will do something result in their doing it. Past experience has proved the need for some form of Federal stimulation. Present experience is proving the rather limited Federal program is filling that need to a far greater extent than ever thought possible.

WATER A NATIONAL PROBLEM

From these seven findings, Mr. Speaker, the joint committee holds that local waste treatment facilities are primarily a local concern and their construction should be primarily a local or State financial responsibility. Now primarily under Public Law 660, the construction of waste treatment facilities is definitely a local

financial responsibility. In the first section of the act itself Congress declares it "to be the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution, to support and aid technical research relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, and to provide Federal technical services and financial aid to State and interstate agencies and to municipalities in connection with the prevention and control of water pollution." So the committee is doing nothing more than restating the declared policy of Congress in this regard. And nothing in Public Law 660 detracts from that primary local responsibility in any way.

The construction phase of the Federal pollution program is dependent on local responsibility. The municipalities initiate action through their State pollution control agencies who must approve each and every application for a Federal grant. These State agencies are given the responsibility of establishing a priority list so that the most important projects in each State are sure to receive a Federal grant from the limited funds available. The local communities make all the arrangements, do all the work, and put up, as the committee itself points out, 90 percent of the money. If this is not primarily local responsibility, I cannot imagine what is.

By saying that the responsibility for the construction of waste-treatment facilities is primarily local, it does not follow ipso facto that the problem is exclusively a State and local problem. Far from it. It is also a national problem and therefore a national responsibility. The day is past when we can accept a purely local view on water-resources problem.

Neither stream pollution itself nor the construction of the treatment plants to clean it up can be considered purely local in character. The problem is a national problem. Its solution, while primarily the responsibility of State and local governments, requires Federal assistance. Under the construction grant section of Public Law 660, the Federal Government is doing nothing more than assuming its share of responsibility in solving a national problem.

Not only does the joint committee take the position, following its seven findings, that treatment plant construction financing is a local concern, but it says further that "should communities require additional financing, the funds should be forthcoming from the State governments on a loan or grant basis as the States may determine." There is no question Mr. Speaker, but that they require additional financing. The record is replete with the fact that they do require such financing and this is tacitly admitted by the committee itself in taking the position that the State governments should assist the communities in the financing of the necessary construction.

EXPERTS CITE NEED FOR FEDERAL AID

And finally, Mr. Speaker, the committee takes the position that there is no evidence to demonstrate the continuing need for the present Federal subsidy of

an essentially local responsibility. It is simply amazing that this committee should take this position after a very short period of study during which it could not possibly become fully acquainted with the problem of water pollution and its control. This group, echoing the false charges of the NAM and the chamber of commerce, finds there is no need in an area where the recognized experts in that area find a very crucial and vital need. This committee flies in the face of all the evidence available and without citing one fact to sustain its position, maintains there is no need.

The committee is in disagreement with the Public Health Service which administers this program. Mr. Gordon E. McCallum, chief of the water supply and water pollution program of the Division of Sanitary Engineering Service of the Public Health Service, in an article published in *Water Engineering*, pointed out that the Nation's pollution abatement needs will total \$5.3 billion for the next 10 years. Earlier, Mr. Speaker, I discussed this same point and I refer you again to the table showing the backlog of needs, the obsolescence and new requirements. It is obvious that despite great local effort these needs were not being met prior to the enactment of Public Law 660.

We have seen that it is the committee's contention that the trend toward greatly accelerated local activity began before the enactment of Public Law 660 and therefore there is no need to continue the Federal grant program whose main purpose is to stimulate such local activity. I have already pointed out the fact that the evidence this committee uses to establish its trend are both false and misleading. As further proof of this we find that since the enactment of Public Law 660 an increasing number of States have registered record treatment-plant construction activity. In a survey recently completed it was shown that the number of States in which a record amount of treatment-plant construction was begun has greatly increased since the enactment of Public Law 660. In 1952, four States had a record construction year. They were Delaware, Massachusetts, Mississippi, and South Dakota. In 1953, five States had a record year—New Mexico, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, and Wyoming. In 1954, only three States—Arkansas, New Jersey, and New York. In 1955, again four States—Michigan, New Hampshire, South Carolina, and West Virginia.

Then, suddenly, in 1956, following the enactment of Public Law 660, the number of States having a record treatment-plant construction year jumped to 13—Alabama, Colorado, District of Columbia, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Nevada, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Virginia. Finally last year, as the impetus of the Federal program really began to be felt, 19 States had a record year—Arizona, California, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin. An impres-

sive record, Mr. Speaker, and every indication points to another record year for an ever-increasing number of States in 1958 and beyond. And if this keeps up for another 8 years under Public Law 660, and there is no reason to believe it will not, by 1966 we will have solved the municipal pollution problem in this country. That's what has happened with this small Federal program, which this committee recommends be scrapped.

Another group of experts, Mr. Speaker, disagrees with the committee on the question of need. We have already seen that the Public Health Service which administers the program on the Federal level disagrees. The men who administer it on the State level also disagree. The Association of State and Territorial Health Officers at its annual conference last November 3-8 adopted a resolution favoring a continuance of this program. This association is composed of the chief health officers in all the States and Territories—men devoted to the task of protecting the health of the Nation. These are the men who administer the program on the State level and their resolution citing the need for the continuance of the program is as follows:

RESOLUTION 4: FEDERAL GRANTS FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Whereas the Federal sewage treatment works construction program has been a highly satisfactory joint municipal, State, and Federal endeavor, achieving the goals set forth by the 84th Congress in Public Law 660 in abating water pollution; and

Whereas the increased activity in sewage treatment plant construction due to the program has materially aided in the abatement of pollution problems throughout the Nation; and

Whereas there still continues to be a serious water pollution problem amenable to relief by Federal grants; and

Whereas this program, while primarily designed to provide more adequate sewage treatment facilities, has also exerted and continues to exert a significant influence upon the improvement of the quality of the Nation's water supply; and

Whereas this program is contributing significantly to the betterment of interstate relations, health and recreational facilities of the people of this country; and

Whereas continuation of this construction grant program will eventually eliminate the pollution problem in this country in the time specified by the 84th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers at its annual meeting with the Surgeon General, assembled, November 3-8, 1957, That Federal grants for the water pollution control program be continued up to the total amount authorized under the terms of Public Law 660, 84th Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Surgeon General, to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and to appropriate Congressional committees concerned with such legislation.

This same group, by the way, during the hearings on the bill in 1956 opposed the grant section out of a fear that it would delay rather than stimulate construction. It is a tribute to the administration of the program by the Public Health Service that the State health officers now reverse their position and support the program.

Another group which most certainly qualifies as experts in this field because they deal daily with the problems of municipal pollution are the Nation's mayors. Through their organization, the American Municipal Association, they have come out in favor, not only of a continuation of the program, but its acceleration to \$100 million a year.

Federal, State, and local officials, Mr. Speaker, who work daily with this pollution problem, who know firsthand the needs and requirements, are practically unanimous in their disagreement with the committee's contention that there is no need for a continuation of this program.

Private interests, also, interested in the quality of the Nation's rivers and streams, also support the program and cite the need for its continuance.

The Nation's conservationists have been in the forefront of the fight for clean streams. Fifty million outdoor recreationists who look to water for relaxation believe there is a need for this program. The Izaak Walton League favors doubling Federal appropriations for treatment plant construction.

As League President William H. Pringle pointed out recently:

Operating as a strictly voluntary program and recognizing that the demand for pollution control and most of the financing must come from the grassroots, the Federal Aid to Water Pollution Control Act has proved so popular with local and State public health and pollution control experts that a great backlog of requests for cooperative local-State-Federal projects has piled up.

Sharply disagreeing with the conclusions of the joint committee, Mr. Pringle added:

No citizen organization has had a more constructive record of pollution control activity than the Izaak Walton League. We've worked since the early twenties to bring a stop to the pollution of the Nation's water resources. We've made good progress, but we all have been hampered by lack of a uniform national pollution control policy and program. We have that now, and we have no intention of seeing it abandoned in the misguided name of economy or of returning Federal powers to the States.

It has proved to be the most effective single piece of pollution control legislation ever passed by Congress and is a heartening example of voluntary cooperation by local, State and Federal Government to combat a broad, public evil. The Izaak Walton League will fight with vigor and unity at local, State and National level to assure continuation of the program and will seek increased appropriations in order that completion of the job can be assured within a reasonable period.

In short, Mr. Speaker, experts at all levels of Government and private interests disagree with the joint committee's position that there is no need to continue the program.

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS MISLEAD PUBLIC

From its findings and position the joint committee recommends the following action:

The Joint Federal-State Action Committee recommends that the President request Congress to take necessary action to discontinue construction grants for local waste-treatment facilities.

The committee recommends, therefore, that the governors request the State legislatures to—

- (a) Provide such financial assistance for waste-treatment facilities as may be necessary;
- (b) Strengthen, as needed, State water-pollution-control programs as they relate to both municipal and industrial wastes;
- (c) Improve municipal capacity to raise funds to finance waste-treatment works.

The committee is asking the States to do that which the great majority of them have never done before. It recommends the return to the day when Federal aid for treatment-plant construction was not available to the local governments, causing the great backlog of needs to build up to the danger point. We must face the fact that because of the tremendous demand on the local and State tax dollar treatment-plant construction finds it hard to compete with such more attractive activities and projects as roads, airports, hospitals, parks, and other municipal improvement projects. Let us face it. About the last thing people think about or spend money on is sewage. By the time the local tax dollar has gone around for the more attractive projects, many of which receive Federal aid, there is nothing left for a treatment plant. If we remove Federal aid now, we relegate the construction of these projects to the bottom of the financial totem pole once again, a position it has maintained for many years, considering the terrific backlog of needs which has built up.

As a substitute for the incentive provided by Federal grants under Public Law 680 the joint committee dangles before the governors of each State the prospects of a new-found source of State revenues—namely, 40 percent of the money collected by the Federal Government on local telephone-service taxes. The committee's recommendation for action regarding local telephone-service taxes is as follows:

The Joint Federal-State Action Committee believes that the local telephone-service tax is a logical revenue source for State and local governments. It recommends, therefore, that the Federal tax on local telephone service be changed so as to provide a 40-percent tax credit to those States enacting a 4-percent local telephone tax, not counting taxes already levied prior to the adoption of the credit device. This would mean that the Federal liability under the local telephone-service tax would be discharged to the extent of 40 percent for any taxpayer paying this amount of tax to his State government. At the end of 5 years the Federal levy should be reduced 4 percentage points automatically.

The Joint Federal-State Action Committee recommends that:

1. The President request Congress to take necessary action to provide up to a 40-percent Federal tax credit against the Federal local telephone-service tax for States enacting or increasing such taxes, the credit arrangement to last for 5 years, at which time the Federal tax will automatically be reduced by 4 percentage points.

2. The governors and the legislatures of the several States take necessary steps to avert themselves of this additional revenue source.

According to the committee, an estimated \$370 million will be collected in fiscal year 1958 by the Federal Government from local telephone service taxes.

Forty percent of that—or close to \$150 million—will be made available to the States under the joint committee's plan. Superficially this may be a rather tempting offer. But, Mr. Speaker, nowhere in the report could I find the basis for an assurance that the return of such funds would guarantee their use for pollution control or treatment plant construction. Without such an assurance it seems strange that the joint committee would recommend the outright repeal of the Federal treatment plant grant program before it could be determined that the activity would actually be assumed by the States. And, stranger, indeed, that the President would include this recommendation in his budget even before the full governors' conference acted on it.

This idea of simultaneous reduction of grants and taxes has been considered before. One of the most blue ribbon of all the President's blue ribbon committees—the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—considered this same proposition and reported the following:

The Commission has explored the suggestion that States would be assisted by a simultaneous reduction in Federal grants and certain Federal taxes. This approach would be inadequate in the current situation, since grants serve an essential purpose by assisting in the support of specific functional programs. Moreover, any general or selective reduction or repeal of Federal grants coupled with an equivalent reduction in Federal taxes would intensify the fiscal problems of the lower income States, which would lose far more in grants than they would gain in taxes. On the other hand, a tax cut of sufficient magnitude to indemnify fully every State would result in a total loss of Federal revenue that would far exceed the grant reductions.

An alternative would be to reduce grants to the richer States and increase grants to the poorer. But since the purpose of grant programs is to stimulate and support particular activities in which there is deemed to be an important national interest, the question would arise as to whether the national interest would be fulfilled if changes of this kind were made.

Then, too, it cannot be assumed that taxes surrendered by the National Government would be fully utilized by either State or local governments. For example, recent experience with the Federal admissions tax (which was cut two-thirds in 1954) is inconclusive but not reassuring, despite the fact that its suitability for local use has often been stressed.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, a close examination of this tax-rebate concept shows it is simply not designed to cope with the pollution-control problem—or any other, for that matter. The joint committee's implication that under their proposal such activities as pollution-facilities construction would be continued at its present level is a deliberate attempt to deceive and mislead the American people. The implication simply cannot be justified by the facts.

The Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the House Committee on Government Operations has prepared detailed tables showing the shortcomings of the joint committee's telephone tax-rebate proposal. The subcommittee has been studying this problem and under the chairmanship of the

able gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] has contributed greatly to the study of this serious problem. On February 18 the subcommittee heard testimony from the cochairmen of the joint committee and are currently closely studying the joint committee's report.

Table I below, prepared by the subcommittee, shows the distribution of telephones and local telephone-service revenues per capita in calendar year 1956, by State.

TABLE I.—Telephone service in the United States, distribution of telephones and local service revenues per capita in calendar year 1956, by State

State	Total telephones per 100 population ¹	Percent households with telephone service ²	Local service revenues per capita ²
Alabama.....	19.86	50	\$12.71
Arizona.....	27.17	55	22.76
Arkansas.....	18.21	42	11.22
California.....	44.97	85	33.54
Colorado.....	37.56	77	24.90
Connecticut.....	48.01	98	25.81
Delaware.....	44.14	84	23.04
District of Columbia.....	64.78	87	41.40
Florida.....	34.34	66	19.79
Georgia.....	23.69	56	14.20
Idaho.....	29.43	69	19.13
Illinois.....	40.93	82	30.41
Indiana.....	34.88	78	20.38
Iowa.....	36.21	87	17.32
Kansas.....	35.69	79	19.59
Kentucky.....	21.19	53	12.82
Louisiana.....	26.69	65	16.79
Maine.....	29.33	70	19.08
Maryland.....	36.38	77	25.26
Massachusetts.....	41.14	91	28.69
Michigan.....	36.92	84	24.06
Minnesota.....	35.16	83	19.55
Mississippi.....	15.29	39	9.77
Missouri.....	33.99	73	21.83
Montana.....	32.36	71	16.36
Nebraska.....	34.32	79	19.27
Nevada.....	33.59	55	25.09
New Hampshire.....	32.44	75	20.06
New Jersey.....	44.06	91	26.28
New Mexico.....	25.17	53	16.64
New York.....	46.07	87	36.00
North Carolina.....	19.64	50	11.01
North Dakota.....	23.66	67	13.83
Ohio.....	37.98	83	22.86
Oklahoma.....	32.66	70	19.68
Oregon.....	34.97	74	22.91
Pennsylvania.....	38.68	85	20.97
Rhode Island.....	35.85	78	24.59
South Carolina.....	17.22	44	9.88
South Dakota.....	26.36	66	14.23
Tennessee.....	25.91	63	15.14
Texas.....	30.38	65	20.22
Utah.....	34.68	79	19.43
Vermont.....	30.09	73	18.11
Virginia.....	28.35	65	17.51
Washington.....	27.41	80	25.66
West Virginia.....	22.67	57	13.45
Wisconsin.....	34.92	80	18.91
Wyoming.....	33.07	69	17.74
United States.....	35.45	76	23.23

¹ Estimated by American Telephone & Telegraph Co., as of Jan. 1, 1957.

² Estimated by Federal Communications Commission.

You will note from the table that the total telephones per 100 population, the percent of households with telephone service, and the local service revenues per capita vary widely from State to State, contrary to the joint committee's finding that telephone service is uniformly distributed over the country.

Regarding total telephones per 100 population we find a high of 48.01 in Connecticut and a low of 15.29 in Mississippi. We find 98 percent of the households in Connecticut with phone service—the Nation's high—but only 39 percent in Mississippi—with the wide range between. And the same wide range holds for local service revenues per capita—the basis on which the tax is

collected—from \$36.60 in New York to \$9.77 in Mississippi.

Yet the joint committee maintains the telephone tax is widely and uniformly distributed over the country—not concentrated in a few States. What it fails to point out, however, is that the highest

income level States will receive far more in tax rebates than they now receive in Federal grants for pollution control and vocational rehabilitation, while the lowest income States will receive far less.

Table II shows exactly what will happen under the joint committee's plan.

TABLE II.—Comparison of yield from 4 percent tax on local telephone service and Federal grants for vocational education and waste treatment facilities construction, for selected States

States ranked by income level ¹	Yield from 4 percent tax on local telephone service (in thousands) ²	Federal grants (in thousands)			
		Total	Vocational education		Waste treatment facilities construction ⁴
			Older programs ³	Practical nursing and fishery trades ⁴	
10 highest:					
Delaware (\$2,858).....	\$400	\$539	\$165	\$24	\$350
Connecticut (\$2,673).....	2,200	979	315	36	628
New Jersey (\$2,443).....	5,800	1,838	644	80	1,114
California (\$2,419).....	16,300	3,893	1,620	220	2,053
Nevada (\$2,413).....	200	495	151	18	326
New York (\$2,395).....	22,500	5,056	2,070	236	2,750
Illinois (\$2,383).....	11,000	3,383	1,451	169	1,753
Massachusetts (\$2,206).....	5,500	1,865	638	90	1,137
Michigan (\$2,156).....	6,800	2,712	1,182	140	1,390
Ohio (\$2,154).....	7,900	3,305	1,478	174	1,653
10 lowest:					
Mississippi (\$964).....	800	2,116	826	110	1,180
Arkansas (\$1,088).....	800	1,789	657	84	1,048
South Carolina (\$1,133).....	900	1,735	656	84	995
Alabama (\$1,229).....	1,500	2,162	898	114	1,150
North Carolina (\$1,305).....	1,900	2,727	1,288	168	1,271
Tennessee (\$1,317).....	2,000	2,214	958	120	1,136
Kentucky (\$1,324).....	1,600	2,089	908	114	1,067
South Dakota (\$1,330).....	400	944	253	30	661
North Dakota (\$1,365).....	300	991	257	31	703
Georgia (\$1,400).....	1,900	2,225	964	123	1,138
Total, all 48 States.....	148,000	84,468	33,179	4,228	47,061

¹ Based on per capita personal income, 1956, shown in parentheses.

² Estimated by joint Federal-State action committee, fiscal year 1958.

³ Expenditures for fiscal year 1956. Older programs include agriculture, home economics, trades and industry, and distributive occupations.

⁴ Allotments for fiscal year 1958.

⁵ Allotments for fiscal year 1957.

Source: All expenditure figures from joint Federal-State action committee, progress report No. 1, December 1957. Income data from U. S. Department of Commerce. Prepared by Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, U. S. House of Representatives.

Note that all but 2 of the 10 highest income States (Delaware and Nevada) will receive far more in tax rebates than they now do in the form of Federal grants for pollution control and vocational rehabilitation; 2 of the programs the joint committee recommends be returned to the States.

By the same token, each of the 10 lowest income States will receive less in rebates than they now do in grants for these programs. It is just a case of the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer. It is unfair and unjust to ask these lower income States to suffer even greater financial hardships while turning over to the wealthier States a windfall in tax rebates.

It would be different, Mr. Speaker, if these low income States were not putting forth adequate effort to meet their needs. The fact is, they are. The average fiscal effort of the States is 7.5 percent, which represents the ratio of State and local taxes to personal income within the State.

We find, from a table prepared by the Library of Congress and which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 8, page 10355, that only 4 of the 10 highest income States were above this average effort. At the same time, 7 of the 10 lowest income States were above the national average.

There is no question but that the Nation's lower income States are making a valiant effort to meet their responsibilities, but the lack of funds makes it impossible for them to do without Federal aid in certain fields. Yet these are the States which would suffer most under the joint committee's proposal.

Last October, Mr. Speaker, labor's Economic Review published by AFL-CIO saw the danger inherent in the joint committee's plan and pointed out:

In the first place, lower income States that now receive the largest proportionate share of the Federal grants cannot possibly recoup their losses by levying the taxes that Washington would relinquish. Only the wealthiest States—that need aid least—would benefit from this callous States rights scheme.

This proposal would restore the uncivilized and outmoded concept that only those who can pay the price deserve decent public services. It would curtail or completely eliminate school lunches, vocational training, assistance for the aged, and many other important services in precisely those States in which family incomes are the lowest and, therefore, their needs are most acute. The slight progress already achieved toward raising minimum standards would be reversed.

Secondly, it cannot be taken for granted that these services would continue as in the past, even in the States that are better off. The absence of the stimulus of Federal matching grants would strengthen the powerful reactionary bloc in the State legislatures that always fights adequate appropria-

tions to meet public needs. There can be little doubt that even in the more prosperous States many civilian service programs—now encouraged largely by the existence of Federal aids—would be watered down or ended.

The net effect of the joint committee's plan, Mr. Speaker, would result in the Federal Government giving up \$148 million of revenue in exchange for an assumption by the States, however nebulous, of \$85.5 million in grants—a net loss of \$62.5 million to the Treasury. And without 1 cent of tax reduction for the people.

ACCELERATED CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM NEEDED TO HELP COMBAT RECESSION

Mr. Speaker, because of the great need for enough water of the right quality, pollution control is a vital and necessary function of government, at all levels. The Federal Government has a definite responsibility which it is now fulfilling under Public Law 660. The Federal Government could and should be doing even more, however, especially in light of the present unemployment situation. There is a need now to not only continue the construction-grant program but, because of the economic situation, actually accelerate it.

It is an interesting fact, Mr. Speaker, that the President has put forth a \$2 billion post-office construction program. That amount represents exactly the amount of the backlog needs of treatment plant construction. Yet in this vital area of water conservation the President recommends that we eliminate certain Federal activity altogether. This administration's sense of values is amazing.

As the distinguished chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee pointed out just the other day, an accelerated treatment plant construction program, stimulated by increased Federal grants, would be an excellent recession antidote. Senator CHAVEZ placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 17, on page 2232, tables showing the estimated impact an accelerated treatment plant construction program would have on our economy in terms of estimated payrolls and man-years of labor.

We have seen that under the existing \$50 million a year program, \$200 million of local participation is being stimulated for a total of \$250 million worth of projects. The estimated payroll for this work is \$75 million. The work requires 1,311.9 man-years of labor.

As Senator CHAVEZ has pointed out, doubling the Federal share would result in a comparable doubling of local activity with a corresponding double in payrolls and man-years of work. The projects are planned, Mr. Speaker. We could proceed with them now if sufficient Federal funds were available.

Here is a job crying for attention, Mr. Speaker. A task if left undone which would seriously curtail the Nation's future growth and expansion. A natural area of Federal activity which would add immeasurably to the future strength of the country. An activity if pursued diligently which would produce jobs, increase payrolls, and, most important, protect our most precious natural resource—water. Mr. Speaker, I cannot urge this House too strongly to reject

the President's proposal to discontinue Federal aid for treatment plant construction as recommended by our joint committee and at the same time let us move forward in the battle against pollution at an accelerated rate. For the present, this will be an excellent anti-recession remedy. For the future, it will guarantee a supply of clear, fresh water to our children.

Protection Against Foreclosure of FHA-Insured Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about a bill I recently introduced, the purpose of which is to prevent foreclosure of FHA-insured homes in cases where the owner-mortgagor is in financial straits because of unemployment or other reasons beyond his control.

Since the inception of the FHA program in 1934, approximately 4 million Americans have purchased homes under the favorable terms made possible by FHA mortgage insurance. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that payments are still being made on nearly 2 million of these FHA homes and that the original mortgage on these homes averaged \$7,000.

The purpose of these figures and statistics is to show that the vast majority of homes purchased under the FHA program are owned or, more important, are being purchased by families of moderate means and income.

The object of the bill which I have introduced today, Mr. Speaker, is to give these families a greater measure of protection against unemployment and loss of income than the Federal Housing Act presently calls for. Put another way, the purpose of my bill is to give purchasers of FHA homes the same kind of protection against foreclosure that is written into the GI home-loan program.

Under the GI program, Mr. Speaker, the purchaser or holder of a mortgage has no reason to take immediate foreclosure action against a veteran who is in default. He knows that the law protects him against loss of principal and interest—even though he allows the veteran to continue in default of his mortgage.

The purchaser or holder of an FHA mortgage has no such assurance. On the contrary, he knows that the Federal Housing Administration is precluded from reimbursing him for interest lost from date of default to date of payment. For this reason, as well as others, there is considerably more economic pressure upon the holder of an FHA mortgage to bring prompt foreclosure proceedings against an owner in default than there is on the holder of a GI mortgage.

The bill which I have introduced today would authorize the FHA Commissioner, at his discretion, to acquire an FHA loan in default by issuing debentures to the lender for the unpaid amount of the loan. The FHA Commissioner would be authorized to act on any case where he believes that the homeowner in default has a good chance of ultimately getting back on his feet economically.

This bill does not pretend to be a final answer to the problem. It is introduced in an effort to direct timely attention to a problem of increasing seriousness to mounting thousands of unemployed citizens who are threatened with the loss of their homes through foreclosure.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko, Freedom Fighter on Two Continents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the 12th of February is the anniversary of the birth of two great citizens of the world, lovers of liberty, fighters for freedom, men to whom we in America owe undying gratitude.

The story of Abraham Lincoln, President and champion of human freedom, is learned by every American boy and girl, and has inspired men of good will throughout the world.

The story of Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko, engineer and military strategist, who fought for the freedom of America in our Revolution and then devoted his strength to the struggle for the freedom of Poland, is equally inspiring.

Kosciuszko is the hero of two continents. He was the first foreign patriot to heed the call of "the shot heard 'round the world." Kosciuszko borrowed money to come from Poland to America in 1776 to join in our Revolution. His engineering genius contributed greatly to the American cause; he built the fortifications at West Point; he played a leading part in the Saratoga and Carolina campaigns as line officer and strategist.

George Washington called Kosciuszko "a gentleman of science and merit." Thomas Jefferson said of him: "He is as pure a son of liberty as I have ever known."

The battle won and the United States freedom established, Kosciuszko returned to Poland and led a revolt to remove the shackles of alien governments from his own people. His efforts, alas, failed. But their failure does not diminish the bravery, the sacrifice, the courage of Tadeusz Kosciuszko and the people of Poland.

Lincoln and Kosciuszko both dedicated their lives to the universal struggle for freedom. This struggle goes on, never ceasing, and though Poland is today oppressed under the heavy hand of com-

munist, the love of liberty burns in the hearts of its people. Poland will rise again in freedom, and the policies of the United States will, we pray, hasten the attainment of that goal.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered on yesterday, in Los Angeles, at a Lincoln Day luncheon.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR KNOWLAND AT LINCOLN DAY LUNCHEON AT THE AMBASSADOR HOTEL, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1958

Fellow Californians, today marks the 149th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

In this earth satellite, atomic, and missile age, his words at Bloomington, Ill., on May 29, 1856, have a familiar present day flavor. He said:

"We live in the midst of alarms; anxiety beclouds the future; we expect some new disaster with each newspaper we read * * *"

Lincoln did not panic. He did not become a defeatist. He did retain his sense of direction. Both then and later as President his words of calm, clear appraisal rose above the babble of discordant voices. He was God fearing, but not afraid.

In today's circumstances, we can profit by one of Lincoln's favorite stories about the man who was riding along a backwoods trail and was caught in a storm.

He kept plodding ahead until his horse gave out, and then it grew dark. He had only the lightning to show him the trail. The thunder was terrifying, and, when one bolt seemed to crash at his feet, he fell on his knees.

"O Lord," he prayed, "if it's all the same to you, give us a little more light and a little less noise."

Today, our people need more light and less noise.

Long ago I learned one of the penalties of public life is the abuse and deliberate misrepresentation of one's views that take place.

However, I have great faith that the people of this State can see through the political smog created by designing partisans and will separate fact from fiction.

My grandfather came to California. My father, my children and my grandchildren were all born here. For a quarter of a century I have been active in the public service of this, my native State. My life and such capabilities as I may possess have been and will continue to be devoted to the continued advancement of California and all of its people.

If elected I will enter the office of Governor with no obligation but to serve the whole people of California in conformity with my constitutional oath.

California, with its 14 million people, has a vital interest in the question of national defense.

Our industry in peace and in war has made a great contribution to our Nation's defense capabilities.

California is not only a great and important part of the American aviation industry, but is destined to be equally important in the rapidly developing missile program. We will also be a significant factor in the research, development and production of vehicles for travel into outer space.

The words of Lincoln in his annual message to Congress on December 1, 1862, have a significant meaning to us today:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so must we think anew, and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save the country."

In this year of 1958 we must neither be defeatist nor complacent.

After the Soviet sputniks and before the successful launching of the American Explorer there were some voices at home and abroad that spoke as though America was defenseless and the Soviet Union superior in almost everything.

They lost their perspective and sense of proportion. Carried on and if unchallenged, they would have unwittingly or deliberately laid the foundation for a Munich-type surrender to the godless tyranny in the Kremlin.

Sputnik did not overnight cancel out our strategic air force which will remain a major deterrent to Soviet aggression as long as we see to it that its capability keeps modernized.

We have nuclear-driven submarines and we are going to continue to expand this important segment of our Navy. With a stepped-up program and with the Polaris missile such a fleet will be a mighty deterrent force, not dependent upon foreign bases.

California industrial and defense establishments are playing a vital role in the production of solid fuel propellant which this and other missiles will use. We have the mightiest Navy afloat.

Our Army, Navy, and Air Force are equipped with a wide variety of missiles and other weapons and more are coming into operational stockpiles each week. These are available for tactical use in addition to our strategic striking power.

The modernization of our Armed Forces is continuing and must have a high priority as long as the danger of Soviet aggression continues.

If Soviet aggression takes place, our capability to strike back by air, by sea, and from land—from all directions of the compass and with overwhelming force—is fully understood in the Kremlin even if others have lost sight of this fact.

The real danger is that the Soviet rulers may ignore their own realistic military intelligence and give too much weight to the gloom and doom brigade that is trying its best to paint America as a defenseless Nation militarily, a stalemated country governmentally and with a public opinion so divided that our country would have neither the power nor the will to act in the event of Soviet aggressive action.

No more fatal mistake could be made by the rulers in the Kremlin. This generation of Americans will not surrender our freedom, betray our allies, nor abandon our moral position strongly based upon a belief in God and the dignity of man as a free individual rather than a mere cog in a regimented totalitarian state.

Now California is the second State in population in the Union, and by 1970 we will be the first. We must plan for the future.

Our objective is to provide a growing number of jobs, at good wages, for our steadily-increasing population.

This can best be done by encouraging profitable agricultural, industrial, and service activities.

From such activities we can get stabilized employment for our people and dependable revenues for our local, State, and national governments.

We are passing through a period of economic readjustment. The country is sound. We will pull out of this period with the added stimulation of new capital investment of industry and of our national defense requirements.

When tax burdens become unbearable, when investment opportunities are no longer attractive, when labor demands become such that business cannot operate at a fair profit for the risk involved, the elimination of old firms, or the failure to start new ones hurts all of our people.

Our unemployment throughout the Nation is approximately $4\frac{1}{2}$ million, and our total working force is 62 million.

Labor, management, investors, and the public all have a vital stake in the maintenance of employment and the opening up of new investment opportunities that will create more jobs.

A high order of economic statesmanship is needed.

Management should make every effort to keep their employees at work and to seek alternative contracts so that competent teams will not have to be dissipated.

The Defense Establishment must develop a greater sense of responsibility and understanding of the problem of the recruitment, transportation, and establishment of workers in a new location where workers find themselves dislocated again within a short time.

Labor, too, has a great responsibility. Any prolonged strike in one or more of our major industries could have an effect of creeping paralysis over our entire economy.

A shutdown in motors could have a highly detrimental effect on steel, coal, railroads, and a whole host of subcontractors scattered throughout the Nation.

No man or group of men in either industry or labor should have the power to strangle the economic life of 170 million Americans and by so doing perhaps endanger the whole free world.

This is more power than any responsible person should want, and it is far more power than irresponsible ones should be allowed to have.

California has made substantial progress in our elementary and secondary local school system under the constitutional guaranties for their financial support.

As a member of the legislature I played an active part in preserving these guaranties and in providing the revenue system that have made them effective.

Our State university, the State colleges, the primary and secondary educational system must be kept abreast with our State's growth and meet the new challenges that face this generation.

Recently there was proposed an initiative proposal that would reduce State sales tax from 3 to 2 percent, and reduce State income taxes in the lower brackets and increase them in the higher brackets.

It has been estimated by competent State tax authorities that this proposal, which is being supported by the State American Federation of Labor, would cost the State over \$200 million in revenue and would raise havoc with the State's fiscal structure.

It would place in jeopardy the support of our State's educational system, our social security legislation, the general operation of State government, and would severely handicap a solution of our vital water problems.

I am opposed to such financial irresponsibility, and I call upon my opponent in the gubernatorial contest to oppose this effort

by his supporters in the labor movement to bring about the adoption of this reckless proposition. Where does he stand on this issue?

As a member of the State senate I was chairman of the subcommittee which drafted, and I subsequently handled on the floor, the first unemployment insurance legislation enacted in this State.

I have supported, in the State legislature and in the United States Senate, social-security legislation for old-age assistance, vocational rehabilitation, aid to the blind, and child care assistance.

During my service in Sacramento I supported legislation which assured every worker the right to join a union of his choice. This legislation made illegal the so-called yellow dog contract which had prevented a worker from having that free choice.

As a State assemblyman I cosponsored the antilynching legislation now on the statute books of this State.

As Republican leader of the United States Senate I moved to bring before the Senate and to pass legislation assuring every American that he would not be denied his constitutional right to vote.

In the State legislature, as a private citizen and for more than 12 years as a United States Senator I have actively worked for the development and protection of our resources, river and harbor development, flood control, reclamation, and irrigation projects throughout California.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee I have cooperated with my Senate colleagues and House Members, without regard to partisanship, to help advance sound and constructive public works projects.

As a member of the Senate I took an active part in the fight to restore to this and other coastal States the tidelands which had been taken from us under the New Deal doctrine of Federal inherent powers overriding the right of the States.

Both as a State legislator and as a member of the United States Senate I have been interested in the conservation of our water resources so vital to our future growth and development. I have consistently taken the position that the Federal Government must respect the water laws of the several States.

During the course of this campaign I shall discuss problems relating to our schools, statewide water program, our highway construction, our State hospitals and penal institutions, juvenile delinquency, the reorganization of the State executive department and the readjustment of relationship between the Federal Government and the States.

With a knowledge of the Federal Government and the personalities, Republican and Democrat, in the Congress and in the executive department, I will be able to bring helpful and effective action by the State government in cooperation with our Congressional delegation.

In my announcement of candidacy for Governor of California on October 3 of last year I said:

"Our country would not have gained its independence, nor would we have been able to preserve it during our 181 years if Americans had not been willing and able to face up to controversial issues and with forthrightness and courage to find solutions."

"We cannot and should not evade or avoid using the same yardstick in meeting the challenging problems (local, State, national and international) that confront our generation."

"It is not my expectation that all Californians will agree with every policy I propose or the details of each program I may present. However, they will know where I stand and why I stand there."

The reason I have raised some issues in this campaign is because I believe this is

the hour and that the future of our State and Nation require that they be raised now.

As far as I am concerned, win or lose, I shall not surrender my fundamental beliefs to political expediency.

Last fall, in an extensive tour throughout California, I discussed the importance of a workers' bill of rights to assure members of all labor unions control over their own organizations.

On January 23 I introduced Senate bill 3068 as I stated I would. If elected Governor of California I will recommend similar legislation covering intrastate labor organizations.

A bill of rights for the working man and woman does not and should not constitute an indictment against all labor officials.

Many of these individuals, past and present, have labored unceasingly in the best interests of their fellow man. Unions have played in the past and will assume in the future an important role in the strengthening of our national economy.

It is my belief that unions will continue to grow in membership and importance.

Equally important is that they also grow in responsibility to their members and to the public.

Despite the opposition of the labor bosses I believe that the members of organized labor, their families and the general public recognize the need for such legislation. Among the reasons causing me to raise this issue and introduce legislation were:

1. The public disclosures before the Senate Committee on Labor and Management Activities which have revealed widespread arrogance, corruption, and abuses involving a considerable number of union officials and appointed trustees and supervisors. This has shocked and dismayed not only the rank-and-file union members but all Americans everywhere.

2. The thousands of letters submitting additional evidence of wrongdoing which have been sent to the committee of the Senate and to Senators' offices.

3. The many union members throughout California who have contacted me personally urging that help be given to them to obtain democratic control over their unions' activities and to free them from the tyrannical bossism of labor tycoons.

This is not a partisan issue. It is not just a problem of private concern to the labor bosses or to the members. It is a matter of public concern.

On Sunday, December 8, of last year, Francis Cardinal Spellman delivered a sermon in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City. He said:

"Daily we learn the sordid details of corruption and violence featured by newspaper, radio, and television. The close association of some union leaders with known criminals, the creation of dummy locals, the rigging of elections, extortion, acid throwing, graft, and the misuse of union funds—these blatant violations of the trust of their fellow workers make all of us who are friends of labor feel shame and indignation.

"But we must do more than be shocked or feel morally aggrieved. We must act, and, while there is still time, remove from power unscrupulous leaders and their underworld hirelings. It is a tragic, almost unbelievable fact that these overlords of crime have dared to blueprint plans with the avowed purpose of dividing their underworld empire, thus imperiling the security of America's family life."

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, chairman of the Investigating Committee on Labor and Management Problems, has given his views of the problem. He recently stated:

"We have had ample evidence in our hearings of intimidation and victimizing of rank-and-file members by hoodlum control of some of the unions. The hearings have also revealed raids and plundering of union

treasuries, violence against workers themselves, as well as instances of violence against management. The continuation of our work will, we are confident, result in legislation of benefit to the country and to the 17,385,000 working people in the United States who are members of unions."

The bill of rights for labor has received an enthusiastic reception from almost every quarter with the notable exceptions of (1) a group of union bosses, who naturally enough do not want to see their secure positions of power disturbed and who have vast sums of union funds available to be placed behind their selected candidates; and (2) certain political figures who are in a political alliance with these bosses.

The workers' bill of rights for which I have spoken in California and is contained in the legislation I introduced in the Senate last month provides the following:

1. Election of union officials at least every 4 years by secret ballot with a guaranty that the ballots cast are the ballots counted.

2. Recall proceedings through which union members can replace union officials who misuse their positions of trust and responsibility.

3. Procedures for approval by majority of union members on question of calling, continuing, or waiving their right to strike.

4. Registration and public disclosure requirements of union members' welfare funds whether administered by unions or management.

5. Safeguards for members against unauthorized use of union initiation fees, dues, or assessments.

6. Protection for members against arbitrary or coercive actions by union officials.

7. Restrictions upon the appointments of trustees or supervisors whereby national and international unions gain and hold control over local unions for long periods of time, abrogating their democratic rights and taking control of their treasuries.

8. Penalties for cases involving collusion between management and union officials against the interests of union members.

In my judgment, these provisions will safeguard basic human rights of union members and give them a representative voice in the management of their unions to whose support they contribute, year in and year out, a part of their wages.

The American way of life has its foundation fixed on maintaining the God-given dignity of man and the noble aspirations of free men in a free society.

In order to assure the success of our purpose, we must always insist that with power must go responsibility.

Now let us turn to the issue of voluntary versus compulsory unionism.

I believe in the right of every American worker to join a union. This right to join a labor organization is now and will continue to be protected by law. So this is not the issue.

I believe in the right of the majority in a plant, department, or bargaining unit to bargain collectively for the employees within that bargaining unit. This right is now and will continue to be protected by law. So this is not the issue.

The issue then arises on whether a worker, against the dictates of his conscience, shall be compelled to join a union in order to hold a job and earn a livelihood for himself and family. I believe in voluntary and not in compulsory unionism. This is the issue.

The late Samuel Gompers, the founder and the father of the American Federation of Labor, pleaded the cause of voluntarism in unions. He also wrote in his autobiography printed in 1925, page 132 (this quote has been curiously omitted from the newly revised and edited edition of 1957):

"I held and I hold that if a union expels a member and he is deprived of a livelihood, in theory or in fact, insofar as he and his

dependents upon him are concerned, it is capital punishment."

Honestly administered unions responsible to their members, whose first goal and purpose is to protect and advance the cause of the workingman at the bargaining table, will be infinitely stronger and more effective than any boss controlled compulsory union in existence.

It was under the system of compulsory unionism that the Senate Investigating Committee revealed the following:

1. A national officer of the teamsters union took over \$320,000 of union members' money for personal use. For this and other deplorable reasons the organization was expelled from the AFL-CIO on charges based upon corruption and dictatorship. Yet the 1,700,000 members, under compulsory membership, are left captives within this same organization.

2. Forty-five percent of the total union income of a New York union found its way into the pockets of its secretary-treasurer and his family.

3. The chief officer of the operating engineers (salary \$50,000 per year) used over \$350,000 of union members' funds without accounting to the members.

4. Officials of Operating Engineers Local No. 3, a California union, participated in sizable misuse of union funds and the rigging of union elections.

Regarding this at the committee hearing on January 23, Senator MCCLELLAN said:

"I hope that the local officials out there (California) are taking note of the record that is being made here, the testimony that is being adduced, that reflects the crimes that have been committed, and that they will give attention to their duties in this respect. I feel there should be law enforcement. If we are not going to have law enforcement in this country, people who want to exploit honest working people through the medium of labor unions and dictatorial control over them, and the misuse of their funds, can have a field day in this country.

"There is a great responsibility, in my judgment, upon local officials, whenever these crimes are exposed by this committee, to take action. I am hopeful that the officials in California will take note of the views that I am expressing, and give some attention insofar as it is possible for them to do so in the discharge of their duties to these crimes being reflected in this testimony."

These fraudulent activities, just a few among the shocking multitude disclosed, could not occur where wage earners were permitted to voluntarily join or not join a union, where they were not compelled to pay their union dues to dictatorial or dishonest officials.

Compulsion (join or starve), which has destroyed nations and empires down through history, is undemocratic, dangerous, unfair, and unsound. Under systems such as those in Nazi and Communist countries only card-carrying members of organizations supported by the totalitarian regimes are the ones to get preference for employment. Nonmembers get what is left.

An important economic factor to any State is the percentage increase in per capita income year by year, and these figures show that the average percentage increase of the 18 voluntary union States exceeds that of California itself since their adoption of voluntary union laws.

Our people would be outraged if their right to free assembly and to free speech were conditioned by their belonging to any particular organization; we would not permit compulsory membership in a church; we would be dismayed if our right to vote were subject to affiliation in a party of someone else's choosing.

Another fundamental basic right of the first magnitude is the right of employment, the right of a worker to a job without being

compelled to join a private organization, without being compelled to pay tribute to it in order to hold that job and thus earn money with which to support himself and his family.

Those union leaders who campaign so vigorously for compulsory unionism do not always practice what they preach. During the last month in the Nation's Capital in Washington, the parent body of the AFL-CIO refused to recognize a group of their own employees who were labor organizers. These employees formed an independent union and requested recognition under the Taft-Hartley law. Officials of the AFL-CIO not only refused to recognize their union, but in a subsequent "reduction in force" action, over half of the people dismissed were disclosed to be the most active members of the new union.

Wherever a union is operating with responsibility and respect for its members, workers will voluntarily join that union and participate in its affairs.

Compulsion, if it continues to grow, will ultimately undermine and destroy a vital part of our American way of life—freedom of choice. To an alarming extent this has already been done to an important segment of our population. That is why I say, this is the hour and the time is now.

I find it hard to understand why those who profess their belief in the democratic processes should fear to let the 6 million registered voters of California have a direct vote on this issue. Do they fear the judgment of the electorate?

The union bosses believe that they can regiment their 1,900,000 members into passing resolutions and contributing campaign funds from the union treasury, by assessment or other means. Do the labor bosses fear that when the individual worker gets into that voting booth, with his secret ballot, as a free and uncontrolled American, he will show his independence and vote for voluntary and not compulsory membership?

My opponent and the labor bosses allied with him should welcome this solemn expression of the people of this State.

But by manipulating the title of the initiative and by the vast work being expended in trying to prevent it from qualifying on the ballot, one can deduce that they fear a direct mandate. They seem to want to circumvent the people's decision which their power of political coercion cannot control.

On February 5 at Miami Beach, leaders of the AFL-CIO publicly marked me for political liquidation at the polls this fall.

I accept the challenge. I shall not evade or avoid the issue.

As for me, I do not intend to complacently allow California to become a satellite of Walter Reuther's labor-political empire.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Hero of the American Revolution (1746-1817)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the success of the American Revolution was assured by the wholehearted efforts and the sacrifices made by the people here struggling for their independence. Other peoples, not native of this country, or related to the people living here, also contributed significantly to the success-

ful culmination of that historic event. Thaddeus Kosciuszko of Poland, that intrepid and gifted soldier of freedom was one of those whose personal participation in the American Revolution marks him as one of the great heroes of his day.

Born in Poland in 1746, he came to America in 1776 and immediately applied for military service. He was admitted, and assigned to the task of fortifying the Delaware River. He performed this task so well that he was made a colonel of engineers in the Continental Army. Subsequently he was in the Northern Army and saw action at Ticonderoga; he also supervised the fortifications at Saratoga. Then he was put in charge of the building of fortifications at West Point. He was one of the first of the Continentals to enter Charleston after that city was evacuated by the British. On October 13, 1783, he was made a brigadier general.

After serving the cause of this country brilliantly and with success, he returned to his native Poland in order to fight for her freedom. He did this for 20 years, and breathed his last as an exile in Switzerland. February 12 is the 212th birthday of this patriotic Pole, and we solemnly commemorate it as a sign of appreciation of his services to this country.

Judge Stephen E. Rice, of the Tax Court of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much to inform the House of the death of Judge Stephen E. Rice, of the Tax Court of the United States. Judge Rice died Sunday, February 9, at the age of 52 at the Naval Medical Center in Bethesda. He had been in ill health since the latter part of December.

Nationally recognized for the high caliber of his work on the Tax Court, Judge Rice was also well known and highly regarded on Capitol Hill where he served as legislative counsel of the United States Senate for a number of years. He was a member of a distinguished family in my district and was the son of Hon. and Mrs. S. E. Rice, both now deceased, of Apalachicola, Fla. Like his father, he enjoyed a noted career in public life.

Judge Rice had served on the Tax Court since October 16, 1950. He was originally appointed by President Truman and reappointed by President Eisenhower for a succeeding full term on June 2, 1956.

Born in Apalachicola, Fla., Judge Rice attended Marion Institute Preparatory School, Marion, Ala. He was graduated from the United States Naval Academy in 1926 and served in the Navy as an ensign from 1926 to 1928.

He received a bachelor of laws degree from Columbia University Law

School in 1931 and was admitted to the bar in New York the following year. He was later a member of the bar of the District of Columbia, and of the United States Supreme Court.

After practicing law in New York City for 2 years, Judge Rice joined the staff of the Legislative Counsel of the United States Senate, where he served until 1942.

At the outset of World War II, he was recommissioned in the Navy and served as assistant air officer, U. S. S. *Lexington* in the Pacific campaign.

Wounded in 1944, he returned to the United States and retired as a captain, United States Naval Reserve. His medals include the Bronze Star, Purple Heart, Asiatic-Pacific Area Campaign with 9 battle stars and Philippine Liberation with 2 stars.

Judge Rice then became Legislative Counsel of the United States Senate, in which capacity he served until his appointment to the tax court.

Survivors include his wife, Lida Johns Rice, and two sons, Stephen E. and Jeffrey B., all of the home address, Oakton, Va.; two sisters, Mrs. Richard Heyser of Apalachicola and Mrs. W. Newton Creekmore of Columbus, Ga.; and an uncle, R. R. Rice, of Rockport, Tex.

Funeral services were held at 11 a. m. Thursday at the Ft. Myer Chapel, with burial in Arlington Cemetery.

Pallbearers were Chief Judge J. Edgar Murdock, Judges C. Rogers Arundell and Norman O. Tietjens, of the Tax Court; Rear Admirals J. P. B. Barrett, Kenneth Craig, Roy A. Gano, and William R. Smedberg, III; Captains Burnham C. McCaffree and Abbott M. Sellers, and Comdr James B. Cash.

My earnest sympathy is extended to the bereaved. Because of my own years of close friendship with Judge Rice, I can understand much more intimately the degree of their loss.

Lincoln and Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 12, we celebrated two birthdays: that of a martyr to the cause of freedom for all Americans, Abraham Lincoln, and of General Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

In commemorating the 40th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence it is worth noting that Kosciuszko was born in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which in 1746 was a federated state of Poland; and that he was a brigadier general of our Continental Army October 13, 1783.

In 1776 Kosciuszko arrived in Philadelphia from Poland and immediately enlisted in the Continental Army. His first assignment was to draw up plans for the fortification of the Delaware River. This assignment resulted in a commission,

Colonel of Engineers. In the spring of 1777 Colonel Kosciuszko was serving with the northern army at Ticonderoga. There he supervised the building of fortifications at Saratoga. Our success at Saratoga was interpreted by the French King to mean that we might win our independence, and France became our ally. Thus the genius of Kosciuszko made a major contribution to American independence. Later he took charge of building the fortifications at West Point.

After taking part in the campaign in the South, he returned to his homeland in July 1784, where he hoped to carry on the fight for freedom. However, Russian might defeated him and he was exiled to Switzerland where he died in 1817.

Address by Hon. J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland, on Receipt of the Distinguished Service Award of the Washington Junior Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, it was recently my great honor to receive the first Distinguished Service Award of the Washington Junior Chamber of Commerce, for my efforts to obtain suffrage for the voteless citizens of the District of Columbia. During the presentation luncheon, I delivered a brief address which several of the Jaycee officials later asked me to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR BEALL, DELIVERED AT THE NATIONAL JAYCEE WEEK LUNCHEON OF THE WASHINGTON JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AT 12:30 P. M. JANUARY 23, 1958, AT THE BURLINGTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

There was a time, and not too long ago, when the members of the Junior Association of Commerce were consistently referred to as (and I quote) "The future leaders of America."

Today, however, you no longer deserve that title, at least not in its entirety.

Today, in every section of our Nation, you gentlemen are acknowledged and respected as the current leaders of our country.

This leadership entails responsibilities, of course, and before saying anything else, I want to congratulate you sincerely for the way in which you have accepted and lived up to those responsibilities.

It is not a mere platitude to say that this great Land of the Free is deeply indebted to you for your work, and we, your fellow citizens, thank you sincerely.

During all of my 15 years on Capitol Hill, I have tried to follow the orders of my constituents and friends.

I mention this because prior to this meeting today, I was told that I should speak about voting in the District of Columbia.

Therefore, as a man who likes his job and is doing everything possible to retain it, I shall continue to do as my friends tell me.

As most of you know, the land which is now the District of Columbia originally was part of Maryland.

Furthermore, in addition to donating land for the seat of our national Government, Maryland got together with Virginia and gave \$170,000 to get the construction of buildings started, since the Federal Government had no money of its own for such purposes.

I wonder if our forefathers in Maryland—the Free State—would have approved of such grants if they had known that the land they sacrificed and the money they appropriated was to be used for a city where the citizens would not be permitted to exercise the basic right to vote.

I hardly think so.

In fact, when I introduced my bill to provide for the residents of the Capital to participate in presidential elections, I felt as though I were helping to right an injustice that must be giving our Maryland ancestors a very uneasy eternal rest.

But my bill alone means nothing unless it receives national support.

The reason for this, as you well know, is because to gain the vote for the residents of the District, we must obtain a constitutional amendment.

I can assure you that they are not easy to come by.

On the other hand, we must not forget that the man who says "It can't be done" is liable to be interrupted by somebody else who is doing it.

What, then, must we do?

In the first place, we must obtain passage of my bill, which will take a favorable vote of two-thirds of the House and the Senate.

Then we must get the approval of three-fourths of the State legislatures.

To accomplish this, we need what is referred to in politics as grassroots support.

And going one step further, the way to obtain grassroots support is to do some politicking.

That's where you and the thousands of other members of Junior Associations of Commerce from coast to coast come in.

I've met many of your group, and I know how effective you can be at politicking.

So keep it up on this bill.

Buttonhole your Senators, your Representatives, and your State officials.

It has been said that the world can be divided into three classes—those who make things happen, the many who watch things happen, and the overwhelming majority who have absolutely no notion at all of what is happening.

You members of the Junior Association of Commerce are in the select group who make things happen, and I have the utmost confidence that you will prove it again in this case.

Some persons, I know, will ask why we are so interested in the approximately 802,000 citizens who are voteless in this city.

The answers are obvious.

In the first place, they are American citizens who have certain inalienable rights under our form of government, one of which is the right to cast their ballots for their elected officials.

What has happened to our 15th and 18th amendments if they do not apply to all citizens?

I don't remember any if's, and's, or but's excluding residents of the District of Columbia.

In addition to that, we cannot forget the importance of each and every individual vote in this country.

Thomas Jefferson, for instance, was elected President by one vote in the electoral college.

So was John Quincy Adams.

Rutherford B. Hayes was elected President by one vote.

His election was contested and it was referred to an electoral commission.

Again he won by one vote.

And listen to this:

The man who cast that deciding vote, a Congressman from Indiana, was a lawyer who had also been elected by a margin of one vote, which, incidentally, had been cast by a sick client of his who insisted on being taken to the polls to vote.

Just one vote gave statehood to California, Idaho, Oregon, Texas, and Washington.

That's a big chunk of territory, and today the millions of people who are living there are Americans by just one vote.

Does this one vote situation apply only to the past?

Of course not.

A draft bill for World War II passed the House by just one vote.

In 1944, one more additional Democratic vote in each of Ohio's 8,800 precincts would have defeated one of the greatest statesmen of our times, Senator Robert Taft.

In 1948, one more additional Republican vote in each of the same 8,800 precincts would have carried the State for Dewey instead of Truman.

Don't ever let anyone tell you that each individual vote isn't important.

And consequently, don't let anyone talk about the potential vote of the District of Columbia as being insignificant.

I'd like to mention one other thing about voting that doesn't occur to many people.

You know—and I know even more—that many people think of the word "politician" as some sort of a nasty expression, and they claim that they just don't want to get mixed up in politics.

However, these very same people forget that every time they cast a vote they are politicians.

That is the importance of their vote.

Politics is American government at work, and the only time it becomes dirty business is when the people with ideals abandon it.

Ignoring your responsibilities is the fastest way of creating an unsavory government.

And here again we must think of the real tragedy, the real injustice, the real evil in the present voting situation in the District of Columbia.

Here we have men and women who know their responsibilities.

Here we have men and women who are willing to shoulder their responsibilities.

But here, in the city which, more than any other, symbolizes the ideals of our republican democracy, we have a system which makes these same men and women second-class citizens.

Whenever I think of this subject, I cannot help recalling the friend of mine who very jokingly said he saw a silver lining in the fact that District of Columbia residents can't vote.

"At least," he said, "they can't have any election scandals."

Well I assured him that we'd just as soon have the opportunity, and I told him this story.

There was a farmer watching a golfer for the first time, and taking a very keen interest in the spectacle.

First the golfer drove into the rough.

Then he got stymied by a tree.

After that he got caught in a sand trap.

And finally, at long last, he dropped the ball onto the green and sank it in the hole.

"My, my, my," observed the farmer. "Ain't you in an awful fix now."

Likewise, there is no question at all that the District will have numerous problems when its citizens finally get their right to vote.

But every State, every county, every city and township in this country has had the same problems, and given the same opportunity, we'll jump at the chance to have them, too.

I might mention, before concluding my remarks, that gaining the vote for the Dis-

trict of Columbia in presidential elections is only a part of the problem we are facing here.

We also have to get a home rule bill passed, and the sooner the better.

I had the privilege of introducing the administration's home-rule bill during the 1st session of the present 85th Congress, but I can assure you that I am not so wedded to its terms that I would fight some other adequate measure.

We need some sort of home-rule bill desperately.

We need it now.

Now, in conclusion, I want to return for a moment to my original topic—my resolution to provide that the people of the District of Columbia shall be entitled to vote in presidential elections.

Quite a few persons have thanked me for introducing this measure.

And believe me, I appreciate hearing such kind words.

The facts of the matter, however, are that it is usually quite simple to introduce a bill and quite difficult to get it passed.

The aid which you and the Jaycee associations in other areas have given and are continuing to give is extremely necessary in obtaining favorable passage of this measure, and that is why I should be the one expressing gratitude.

You have done a truly magnificent job.

I know you will keep it up.

Working together, we shall make Washingtonians into first-class, voting citizens.

Lincoln and Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on the anniversary of their respective birthdays, let us pay tribute today to the memory of two great men who have played important roles in the history of our Nation—Abraham Lincoln and Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

These two great men, living in different periods, shared the same respect for the dignity of man, and abiding love for our Nation. Each in his own way has helped to make the United States what it is today.

I am certain that it is not necessary for me to recall General Kosciuszko's gallant participation in our Revolutionary War. He was an outstanding military leader, and took a prominent part in the Saratoga and Carolina campaigns. He built the fortifications at West Point, the location of our National Military Academy.

What is particularly impressive about General Kosciuszko's assistance in our Nation's struggle for independence, is the fact that he did not hesitate to cross the ocean to fight for the principles in which he believed. His devotion to the cause of freedom and liberty should be an inspiration to all of us.

In like manner, President Lincoln's courageous stand for freedom and union shall forever remain inscribed in the annals of our national history. He piloted our Nation through a critical and tragic period, preserving the Union, and

opening the doors to a great future for the United States.

As we recall the achievements of these two men, let us reaffirm our determination to strive for freedom and justice for all.

And let us express the hope that the day will soon arrive when the people of Poland will regain their full independence, and be able to order their lives in accordance with the principles which they have consistently upheld throughout the centuries of their national existence; the principles of freedom, justice, and a parliamentary form of self-government.

John W. Emmert, Superintendent of Glacier National Park, To Retire— Cited for Distinguished Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, John W. Emmert, superintendent of Glacier National Park, will retire on March 31, after a record career of distinguished service in our national parks.

Not only is Jack Emmert the oldest employee of our national park system in point of service, but he went to work 5 years before the Park Service was established.

Born in Virginia, Jack went to work as an assistant electrician at Yosemite National Park in 1912, and has served continuously since that time, with time out for Navy duty during World War I.

He was successively electrician, electrical engineer, and assistant superintendent at Yosemite. In 1934, he became assistant superintendent at Yellowstone National Park, serving there until 1943, when he was made superintendent of Hot Springs National Park, Ark. In 1944, he was transferred to Glacier.

When Jack became superintendent of Glacier, the third largest national park and one of the most magnificent scenic areas in the world—there was a war on, and the staff and activities had been cut to the minimum. Under his capable administration, the park staff and facilities have been developed to meet the needs of a flood of visitors which far exceeds anything that had been dreamed of before World War II.

Today, Glacier National Park, in spite of its great size and the complexity of its administrative problems is, under Jack Emmert, one of the best managed areas in the entire national park system.

Among Jack's outstanding characteristics are his ability to analyze problems and follow through. He is able and loyal, has consistently maintained the respect of employees, local and State officials with whom he works so well, and of visitors to the parks. He has sacrificed his personal interests to do his job.

Jack has cooperated with the greatest effectiveness in the administration of Waterton-Glacier International Peace

Park, involving the United States and Canada. His fine relationship with Canadian officials has assisted materially toward the success of this park.

Because of his outstanding record, Jack Emmert received the Distinguished Service Honor Award, the Department's highest form of recognition, from the Department of the Interior in 1953.

Upon his retirement, Jack will go to Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, where he owns a home.

Part of this fine man's fine record is the citation which accompanied the honor award. It follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,

Washington.

Citation for distinguished service, John W. Emmert, in recognition of outstanding accomplishments in administering Glacier National Park.

With the exception of brief naval service during World War I, Mr. Emmert has been associated with the National Park Service since 1912. He was assistant superintendent at Yosemite and Yellowstone National Parks and superintendent of Hot Springs National Park. In 1944 he became superintendent of Glacier National Park, which position he now holds. In his present assignment, Mr. Emmert has administered the complex problems of our third largest national park so ably that it has become one of the best-managed areas in the entire system. His keen understanding of the relationship between the park and adjacent communities has fostered excellent cooperation with other international, national, State, and local agencies. Typical of Mr. Emmert's leadership and vision was his role in coordinating local arrangements between the Federal Government and the State of Montana in acquiring through an exchange of lands approximately 10,000 acres of State school lands located within the park, bringing to a successful conclusion many previous attempts to consummate the transaction. He also played a prominent part in promoting harmonious relationships with Glacier's sister national park, Waterton Lakes, which is the Canadian portion of the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park. Mr. Emmert's unusual tact and ability in his negotiations with others have been instrumental in making possible these outstanding achievements, for which he is granted the highest honor of the Department of the Interior, its Distinguished Service Award.

DOUGLAS MCKAY,

Secretary of the Interior.

Justice to Farm People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a significant address on the moral and practical issues involved in utilizing God's gift to us of abundant food and providing justice to farm people was given by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] before the Church World Service luncheon at the Statler Hotel on December 5.

Because the address reflects a broad understanding of the real issues involved in much of the farm policy debate, as well as focuses needed attention on the

opportunities for using our abundance constructively in support of peace and freedom in the world, I believe it should be widely read.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S ABUNDANCE AND WORLD NEEDS

(Full text of address by United States Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, before Church World Service luncheon, Statler Hotel Missouri room, December 5, 1957)

Church World Service, the agency through which cooperative overseas relief and welfare programs are carried out by the Protestant churches of the United States, is a notable example of the Christian spirit of sharing with our less fortunate neighbors.

Abundant food is America's greatest blessing. United States agriculture is the most efficient, most productive the world has ever seen.

The 1957 crop is equal to the alltime record set the year before, in spite of deliberate efforts that were made by our National Government to curb our abundance.

United States farmers doubled their output per worker in the past 15 years; far more than the increase in output per worker in industry.

Yet our farm abundance generally seems like a curse instead of a blessing to the farmers whose skill, hard work, and diligence produces it.

Per capita income of farm people in 1956 is well below one-half that of nonfarm.

Per-hour earnings of dairy farmers in eastern Wisconsin in 1956 averaged only 43 cents; (U. S. Department of Agriculture figures. Average farm has 129 acres and total investment of \$33,770 in land, buildings, machinery, equipment, and livestock. Forty-three cents per hour return on labor is computed on basis of allowance of 5-percent return on capital in farming operation.)

These returns contrast as follows with 1956 returns to manufacturing industry: \$1.98 per hour average return on labor (not counting managerial return) versus 43 cents; 13 percent or so average return on net equity in manufacturing industry (versus 5 percent).

This raises the most immediate and most apparent set of moral problems for us as a nation in utilizing God's gift to us of abundant food—justice to farm people.

If the public does not establish justice for farm people, agriculture will soon reorganize itself for its own ends. Control over production and pricing policy is being taken away from independent farm families and transferred to centralized agencies in the food processing and marketing field. Under such a system, farm production will be administered so as to maintain prices at levels determined inside the industry, just as our other basic industries do.

If agriculture would reduce output by only 4 or 5 percent, prices would zoom back to the 100 percent of parity level that prevailed in 1952.

If agriculture would reduce output to only 80 percent of capacity—which is exactly what the steel industry is doing right now—there would be hunger and panic in our American cities. And food prices would skyrocket.

This is the practical side of the moral problem of securing justice for our farm people. If we sacrifice our competitive family farming system by neglecting to give justice to farmers—thus allowing a monopolistic vertically integrated structure of food processing and marketing interests to administer food production and prices in a manner similar to the present practice in

the steel industry—then our economy will be compelled to pay vastly more money for significantly less food.

These are the dimensions of our practical dilemma:

Either we extend justice to our family farmers, and wisely utilize the abundant food which they provide; or

Face the prospect of a fairly quick transition toward a centrally controlled, vertically integrated food-and-farming industry which can administer its production and pricing policies in a manner similar to other basic industries.

How shall we manage the agricultural abundance which God's bounty and our family farming system provides for us?

During the past few years, we have tried deliberate waste on a scale that staggers the imagination—on a scale that never before in all history has had an equal.

Under the farm law enacted in 1955, the United States Government is committed or has already paid a total of \$1.4 billion to farmers for plowing under or not producing wheat, corn, cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco.

This enormous expenditure will result in the destruction or failure to produce grain sufficient to provide the entire population of the United States with their normal supply of bread for a full year's time, plus some ham and eggs and a couple of cotton shirts for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

This enormous expenditure is a total, dead loss to the Nation's economy. It will not secure one single whit of soil conservation work on the land it idles. It does not even add to farmers' incomes—for it merely substitutes for the wealth that they are paid to not produce.

This enormous waste of potential food has taken place in a world and in a day when there are millions who suffer from malnutrition. This represents enough bread for the entire American population for a whole year—bread which was not given to our hungry neighbor in Christian charity, but instead was turned under with the plow and the disk, or simply never planted on the idle land.

Certainly, at the very best, this must be described as a monumental failure of moral imagination.

One other example of recently wasted food particularly distresses me—as a representative of Wisconsin, America's dairyland.

In 1954, the United States Government negotiated the sale of the entire supply of dried skim milk in Government storage to animal feed manufacturers. There are many shocking things about this extraordinary operation.

The negotiated price at which more than half a billion pounds of dried milk were sold for animal feed was only 3½ cents per pound. At that very time, and right today, spoiled dried milk was and is being sold for animal feed for three times as much.

Feed manufacturers were and are today voluntarily bidding and paying over 9 cents per pound for dried milk that has become unfit for human consumption. Yet the American Government sold, without bids, its entire supply on hand in mid-1954 of high-quality dried milk that was perfectly suited for human consumption for only one-third the feed price.

This took place in a world and in a day when there are millions who suffer from malnutrition.

Millions of little children in Asia, Africa, South and Central America suffer from the dreaded disease, kwa-shi-or-kor, which causes both mental and physical deformity, and costs the lives of half of the victims who receive hospital treatment. For this ugly killer and maimer of the world's most unfortunate children, a little bit of milk reconstituted from dried milk powder is a perfect and complete cure.

The dried milk that was sold for hog feed in 1954—at one-third of the market price for feed—was sufficient to provide a tall, full 8-ounce glass of milk every day for a full year's time to 24 million children.

Truly, it requires the utmost of charity to describe this squandering for hog feed of enough milk to furnish lifesaving protein every day for a year to 24 million children, as merely a monumental failure of moral imagination.

It is tremendously fortunate, for the judgment of America that mankind will record in history, that there is a brighter chapter in the account of our stewardship of our unprecedented blessing of abundant food.

The American spirit is generous and good. The American people are true to the generosity and goodness in American character if they have the chance—and when their leaders appeal to that generosity and goodness.

American food fed the Allied Nations during World War II. And when the war had come to an end, American food rescued many tens of millions of human beings from certain starvation—in the lands of our former enemies as well as those of our liberated friends and our bleeding allies. Never before in all the history of the world has any people given so greatly and so generously to so many—and thereby rescued so many human beings from hunger and death by starvation.

This great outpouring of American food to the world's hungry continues today. It is a great credit to American ingenuity that our religious organizations—Church World Service and its counterparts of the other great religious faiths—are playing a central and aggressive role in this program.

I use the term "ingenuity" both on moral and on practical grounds. It is ingenious of us, as a Nation, to work in partnership with our own and the world's religious institutions in this work—for we thus express the essential moral impulses from which America's giving springs. And it is ingenious for practical reasons because it works so much better, both for the giver and those who receive, than any strictly governmental or strictly commercial operation could possibly work.

In this American-style partnership of Government and religion, the public underwrites the costs of collecting and buying the food. This is done, as you know, through governmental programs which are primarily motivated by other considerations than the ultimate use of the food—through our farm price-support programs. This is the reaction which is most appropriately, as well as most effectively, handled by the Government.

But the function of distribution, which involves those who receive the gifts in a direct, personal contact, cannot be performed either as appropriately nor as effectively by a state-to-state relationship. Too often, the gift that is granted by the impersonal state is bare of the giver's true spirit. Too often, gifts that are received by another impersonal state on behalf of its hungry subjects, are similarly deprived of a human touch and the spirit of real giving.

So it is truly a credit to our American inventive genius that we have developed this pattern of partnership between Government and religion, a partnership that allows the true motives of our American people to be communicated across thousands of miles of oceans, and through a bewildering process of bureaucracy, directly into the consciousness of the people who wait with hunger at the other end of the line.

As a result of this partnership between Government and religion, what might otherwise appear to be a surplus disposal program is transformed into a people-to-people relationship which binds all men of good will into closer communion and contributes to the lasting peace which we all desire for our

agonizing earth. The moral impulses that are common to all the basic religious philosophies are enabled to speak truly to each other across the boundaries of language, geography, and redtape.

The achievements of this partnership have been truly outstanding. More than four-fifths of all the Nation's voluntary relief work for the hungry and needy overseas has been conducted through the religious agencies supported by more than 100 million Americans who are enrolled in our major religious faiths. More than a billion pounds per year of food, much of it donated by the Government, is being distributed by the major religious agencies. Lifesaving supplies of clothing, medicines, and money for resettlement, economic development, health projects, and other assistance for refugees, are also being provided in companion programs.

I am told that the average contributed dollar in these programs provides for more than 300 pounds of food delivered to destituted areas. While this emphasizes the tremendous importance of the Government's function in this program, in providing the supply of food for shipment, it also underscores the marvelous efficiency and economy of the religious agencies in distributing these supplies to the human beings who need them.

I am particularly pleased to learn that since this program got under way 3 years ago, more than 9½ million persons, mostly children, have received at least one glass of milk every day through the partnership efforts of the American Government and the religious agencies of the American people.

But we cannot—we must not—rest on self-praise for our accomplishments. There is much need yet to command our compassion.

I have been deeply moved by these words of a well-known German theologian, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, written while he was in prison:

"The hungry man needs bread, and the homeless man needs a roof; the dispossessed need justice and the lonely need fellowship; the undisciplined need order and the slave needs freedom.

"To allow the hungry man to remain hungry would be blasphemy against God and one's neighbor, for what is nearest to God is precisely the need of one's neighbor.

"It is for the love of Christ, which belongs as much to the hungry man as to myself, that I share my bread with him and that I share my dwelling with the homeless.

"If the hungry man does not attain to faith, then the guilt falls on those who refused him bread.

"To provide the hungry man with bread is to prepare the way for the coming of grace."

Who is the hungry man, who is the homeless man, in the world today?

There are still 6 million refugees without homes or work in Europe, the tragic aftermath of man's most tragically destructive war.

There are nearly a million Arab refugees in the Middle East, part of the enormous human cost of the conflicts in the land from which three great world religions sprung.

A torrent of more than 100,000 men, women, and children is streaming every year out of Communist China, into tiny, teeming, tragic Hong Kong, where there is scarcely space, much less work and food.

The expert leaders of your organization—Church World Service—estimate that the world total of refugees today is 30 million, and these comprise only the very most desperate of the earth's homeless, ragged, and disease-ravaged hungry people.

This total does not begin to count many millions more whose hunger is stabilized and unspectacular, but who never achieve adequate diets year in and year out, and who ultimately die of malnutrition at an average age that may be only one-third the life expectancy of an American.

"To allow the hungry man to remain hungry would be blasphemy against God and one's neighbor, for what is nearest to God is precisely the need of one's neighbor."

This, it seems to me, is a moral injunction upon all of us, as citizens, just as surely as in our capacity as Christians. It has real and immediate pertinency to the issues that confront us as citizens right today.

Can there be a moral defense for a soil-bank program which has subsidized the waste of enough potential grain to supply all America with bread for an entire year?

Can there be a moral defense for any national food policy which regards farm surpluses as a burdensome scourge?

Or which permits agricultural abundance to impose a real and severe hardship upon the conscientious farm people who produce it?

Or to turn the problem squarely around, a policy which assures the farmers of adequate incomes only on the condition that they produce slightly too little, and penalizes them for providing us with slightly too much?

It is true that the primary task of shaping a food policy for the Nation must be assigned to the politicians, and the economists, and the businessmen, and farmers. I am one politician who feels deeply the moral problems which it involves, and I appeal in complete sincerity for the help and guidance of religious leaders in the national effort to solve them.

As for me, the moral guideposts which I recognize point very clearly to a number of fundamentally important conclusions in the field of my responsibility as a Member of the United States Congress:

I believe that the food which saves a child's life and health in a Church World Service refugee camp in Hong Kong serves a use as high as any that is produced anywhere beneath the sun. I do not believe that we can, in good conscience, term it a burdensome surplus.

I believe, in fact, that the world has too little food rather than too much. In the world of today, where there are millions who suffer from malnutrition, and even from famine, the basic moral imperative is for us to devise ways and means to get our abundant food to those who need it.

Certainly the great work in which the religious relief agencies are playing such a vital and constructive role must be sustained and expanded. We need to accept this work as a full-scale national responsibility, instead of treating it as an accidental incident of our farm problem. In short, the cost of feeding the hungry should be regarded as a legitimate obligation of the public, instead of an onerous burden imposed by subsidizing our farmers.

We do not treat military aid to our allies as a subsidy to the producers of tanks and planes and rifles; we should no longer treat famine relief to our allies as a subsidy to the producers of wheat and milk.

But we need to go far beyond the defensive reflex of emergency feeding of the victims of famine and wars and political dislocation. We need to greatly expand the use of our abundant food for positive, constructive building to help create the improved economies that are absolutely essential as a foundation for political stability, progress, and peace.

It is too shortsighted to regard food merely as a means to sustain life. Truly, it does little good to send our food to people to help them to survive this season's famine, only to leave them no better able than they were before to cope with the next famine that will come along.

We must raise our sights and stretch our imaginations. We must see that food can also be the source of human energy with which the means for a better life can be constructed.

Let me give you a simple example of one way that this can be done:

Consider a little village in India—just like many thousands of real Indian villages today. The people of the village are forced to work their lives out, with extremely inadequate tools, to scratch a bare subsistence from their impoverished soil. In a good year they barely survive; in bad years many die.

This typical village often does have a surplus of food during the growing season. But there is no refrigeration, nor any other adequate means of storing this perishable surplus food. And there is no road over which this seasonal surplus can be transported to the nearest city to trade for better tools, or for fruit jars for canning food, or the other simple items that could break the endless chain of privation. For want of a road, the village economy is chained to a treadmill on the brink of famine.

The United Nations has shown in small pilot-plant projects that surplus food can be used in underdeveloped economies such as this to finance such capital improvements as roads, bridges, schools, canals, and the like. Surplus food is converted into human energy, which is used to construct capital improvements which permanently raise the productive power of the economy. This can be done even in the most primitive kind of situation, where modern methods are hopelessly beyond reach. A road might be built, for example, by paying people in surplus food to carry earth and stones in baskets on top of their heads.

In the case of our little village, the assurance of a year's food supply would free the people from the obligation to spend all their time and energy to eke out a bare living by subsistence farming. Instead, they might be paid with surplus wheat and dried milk to build a road to the city. At the end of the year, they would have survived, just as if they had spent their time as usual to wrest a bare living from their land. But they would have their road to show for it. And next year, they will be able to transport their seasonal surplus over the road to the city, where they can trade it for efficient shovels, and hoes, and sickles, and other tools. Even such simple tools as these will enormously increase the productivity of their farming economy.

The existence of this simple capital improvement—the roadway—will move the people of our village off from the dreary treadmill of bare subsistence agriculture, into a chain of economic improvements that will build higher and higher levels of progress and prosperity. The city and the whole nation, too, will benefit, and its economy grow, as a result of the increased market for its skills and products which the road opens up.

If you multiply this one tiny village, and this one tiny bit of economic expansion by thousands, as there is the opportunity to do not alone in India, but in the Middle East, and Africa, and South America—the product can be a powerful surge of growth, and progress, and rising hope, throughout the enormous population of the world which today are chained to the treadmill of poverty.

Programs essentially like the oversimplified example I have described are being carried on in a small way—some sponsored by the religious agencies, some by local governments, some by the United Nations. The United Nations pilot plant projects have shown that such a program can be conducted without upsetting normal patterns of trade. The simple truth of the matter is that the food that is contributed in such a program is used to feed people who otherwise would not have eaten—or would have eaten only what they themselves could eke out by their primitive farming methods. It does not reduce the normal commercial

sales of food within the economy which receives it.

Here, certainly, is a method whereby our agricultural abundance can be transformed into a powerful and constructive instrument to build lasting foundations for peace and prosperity in our troubled world.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has twice voted its approval for the United States to join in setting up a world food bank plan through which the world's food surpluses can be employed in this kind of constructive and creative building. A joint resolution has been proposed to Congress which would call on the President to initiate negotiations for establishment of such a program.

Unfortunately, there has not yet been a sufficient sense of urgency to get this kind of work under way on the scale that this age demands.

Certainly, the grave and growing challenge to our position of world leadership makes it more imperative than ever that America unleash its inventive imagination to develop a constructive solution to the dilemma of surpluses in a world where hunger is widespread.

Certainly, there is a moral imperative also that this cruel paradox be resolved in a humane and constructive way.

You of Church World Service, as well as leaders of the welfare agencies of the other great religious faiths, are particularly qualified by your practical experience and your moral insights to provide forceful leadership to the American people in using our blessing of abundant food as a powerful instrument for building the foundations of peace and progress and good will among men.

Louisiana Festival Queens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the most pleasant invasion of the year will occur on Thursday, February 13, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, when 24 beautiful Louisiana festival queens arrive at the National Airport. The queens are coming to Washington to participate in the Louisiana State Society's 11th annual Mardi Gras ball to be held the following night in the grand ballroom of the Mayflower Hotel.

These young ladies, chosen for their beauty, charm, and graciousness, represent the various agricultural and industrial festivals in Louisiana. Included among the girls selected this year are: Miss Brenda Alford, sweetheart of the American Legion; Miss Susie Acklin, queen of the Louisiana Peach Festival; Miss Peggy Sharon Brantly, queen of the North Louisiana Delta Festival; Miss Myrtle Lou Brown, queen of the Rose Festival; Miss Barbara Elizabeth Burdin, queen of the Southwest Louisiana Mardi Gras; Miss Betty Jo Bush, queen of the Yambilee Festival; Miss Sandra Louise Coco, queen of the Louisiana Livestock and Pasture Festival; Miss Barbara Earnest, New Orleans' spirit of Mardi Gras; Miss Marva Glover, queen of the Forest Festival; Miss Janell Guilbeau, queen of the Camellia Festival; Miss

Brenda Hanks, queen of the Delcambre Fishing Industry Festival; Miss Mary Eleanor Harper, queen of the Louisiana Market Poultry Show; Miss Lucie Ann Hebert, queen of the Louisiana Tung Blossom Festival; Miss Patricia Lormand, queen of the International Rice Festival; Miss Cecile Louise Morris, queen of Holiday in Dixie; Miss Billie Jon Mulhearn, queen of the Sugarcane Festival; Miss Alice Rachel, queen of the Domino and Bridge Festival; Miss Pauline Sanders, queen of the Louisiana Gulf Oil Festival; Miss Agnes Santangelo, queen of the Dairy Festival; Miss Annette Soileau, queen of the Cotton Festival; Miss Mary Dell Tinsley, queen of the Orange Festival; Miss Elise Webster, queen of the Shrimp Festival; Miss Mignom Welch, queen of the Paper Festival; and Miss Toni Whittington, queen of the Future Farmers of America.

As chairman of the ball, I and Mr. Felix M. Broussard, president of the Louisiana State Society, have planned a round of entertainment for the lovely queens. On Thursday they will be the inspiration for a Louisiana Night in the Blue Room of the Shoreham Hotel. On Friday at noon they will be the honor guests of the Louisiana Congressional delegation for a luncheon at the Capitol.

Highlight of the queens' Washington visit will be the ball on Friday night which will salute the waterways industries of Louisiana. An outstanding feature of the evening will be the participation in the pageant of a masked costume "krewe," a group of Senators, Representatives, Government officials, and prominent Louisianians under the direction of Senator RUSSELL LONG.

Presiding over the evening's merry-making will be a king and queen whose identities, according to Mardi Gras tradition, cannot be revealed until the day of the ball.

H. R. 10631, a Bill To Spell Out Propriety in Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the so-called lobby law has been cited as a classic example of how not to write a law. It sounds fine, of course, to require individuals or organizations desiring to influence Federal legislation by appearing before Congressional committees and by direct communication to the Members of Congress to file quarterly reports with the Clerk of the House or Secretary of the Senate showing source of and disposition of funds. But it seems to me the net result is nil because the law is so vague. To begin with, there is no provision for administration of the act, and failure of Congress to spell out what it considers improper conduct makes interpretation of the Federal Lobbying Act and establishment of rules and regulations ineffective,

as far as the purpose of the law is concerned.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, I doubt if the result has been to promote high moral standards and accordingly has not strengthened the confidence of the American people in our system of government.

As for Members of Congress, we have not established for ourselves a standard of ethics, and yet we investigate the agencies and departments of the executive branch and hold hearings designed to raise the level of behavior and conduct of officials and employees.

I can only say it is timely to study the matter of ethics in the light of present statements and charges, direct and by innuendo, inside and outside of the House Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight and in connection with the alleged laxity in conduct of members of the Federal Communications Commission and claims of attempts to influence it from all directions, including the legislative branch. And may I say, Mr. Speaker, a great deal of the answer, if not all, may well be included in H. R. 10631, which I introduced on February 10, 1958.

Take the weakness in the present Federal regulations of the Lobbying Act I mentioned at the start. In section 705 of my bill, for example, there is the clear-cut statement that it shall be improper conduct for any person directly affected by or having a substantial interest in the action taken by the Congress with respect to any legislation to give, directly or indirectly, any unusual and valuable gift, favor, or service to any member or employee in the legislative branch of the Government and conversely it is declared improper for any Member of Congress to accept benefits from any person having a substantial interest in legislation.

The measure I introduced likewise covers extending or receiving benefits in the way of gifts or favors to or by officials or employees in the executive branch.

I shall not attempt to cover all the details here, but I do want to make it clear that my bill is very comprehensive. It covers conflicts of interest of Members of Congress and offers a procedure to cover action in such cases in committee or on the floor of Congress.

Job offers, divulging confidential information, expensive entertainment, interceding except by an appearance of record with intentions of exerting influence in decisions—all these possible situations are outlined in the bill, as to propriety in both branches of Government by either party in or out of Federal or elective service.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have provided for full public disclosure of outside sources of income, listing of assets and transactions by officials with a civil service rating of GS-15 or by those on the Federal payroll at \$10,000 or more a year. This would serve both to protect elected, appointed, or other Government officials from suspicion or restrain transactions for profit involving matters or persons connected with any position held.

Mr. Speaker, as I said the other day on the floor of this House, the time is ripe

for a Congressional study and subsequent enactment of a code of conduct for public service. I do not believe any action in this direction can be expected until an aroused public opinion calls for the passage of this kind of a law. I hope one thing resulting from publicity over the House Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight will be a popular demand for passage of a law similar to H. R. 10631.

If other Members interested in this subject would join in urging the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to hold hearings on such a proposal it would be helpful, I am sure.

Meanwhile, propriety in high office will continue to be the foundation of freedom of the individual and the rock on which our Republic stands or falls because people must have confidence in their system of government if it is to survive.

Reds Move on Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Philadelphia Inquirer of December 10, 1957:

REDS MOVE ON INDONESIA

(By FRANCIS E. WALTER)

(In this special article for the Inquirer, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, discusses the current unrest in Indonesia, and the threat of Communist domination of that strategic area.)

While we occupy ourselves with the Soviet conquest of outer space, there is a great possibility that the Kremlin will be able to complete new conquests here, on earth.

Of immediate concern is the prospect that another 80 million people, the people of Indonesia, may be drawn into the orbit of international Communism. The problem of Indonesia is much greater than that of Syria about whose political future we are so much concerned.

In the case of Indonesia, we are apparently faced with a determined effort by President Sukarno to maintain himself in power by not only accepting Communists in his Cabinet but by changing the Republic of Indonesia into a "guided democracy" which would duplicate the model of the Soviet-fashioned totalitarian state.

President Sukarno's regime is opposed by the overwhelming majority of the Indonesian people. It has lost control of vast areas of the multitude of islands which constitute Indonesia, the former Dutch East Indies.

The majority of the people of Indonesia are desperately trying to forestall eventual subjugation by Communist China and the Soviet Union. Indonesian patriotic leaders are fighting for a closer link with the neighboring Philippines, with Australia, and with the West generally. In order to deflect the potential rebellion of the Indonesian people, Sukarno's central government is now attempting to achieve national unity by inciting the Indonesians against the Dutch.

While crowds incited by Sukarno himself expropriate the remaining Dutch enterprises,

such as shipping lines and airlines, Sukarno's representatives in the United Nations have succeeded in manufacturing a smokescreen by raising the issue of the residue of Dutch political control over a part of one of the islands, western New Guinea (Irian). Sukarno is even trying to outdo the excited crowds by ordering 57,000 Dutch residents of Indonesia to leave the country.

Sukarno, an experienced and dangerous demagog, knows how to use every trick of his trade. Having accepted Soviet technical and economical aid, he is now prepared to invite Soviet technicians in much larger numbers than Egypt and Syria have done. The technicians are in reality Soviet Army officers and secret-police operatives skilled in subversion and perfectly qualified to advise Sukarno how to suppress the nationalist opposition. Force is being used by Sukarno, and should the opposition spread, as it very likely will, Sukarno can be expected to declare a state of civil war and thus have a pretext for openly requesting Soviet assistance.

With Communists already wielding tremendous power in Sukarno's government, the presence of Soviet and Chinese military personnel will speed up the transition of Indonesia into another Soviet satellite state.

The Communists are looking hungrily at Indonesia, domination of which would give them control over the entire south Pacific. They gladly accept Sukarno's collaboration as the Japanese did in the Second World War—to help lay their hands on that great, rich land.

After the transition into a Soviet satellite, Sukarno will not last long. He may or may not realize that he is being used temporarily as a Soviet tool. He may or may not know that he will ultimately share the fate of those who have helped Soviet Russia to enslave the peoples of more than a dozen European states. Anyway, it is evident that Sukarno has had to gamble because the steadily growing strength of the nationalist opposition may, in his view, threaten to end his rule.

The United States has been faced with a similar situation before. In 1949, determined support for Chiang Kai-shek could have stemmed the rise of the Communist tide in China. No such support was forthcoming and China is now in the hands of Communists.

Similar hesitation on the part of the United States, and our apparent reluctance firmly to take a stand against Sukarno and on the side of the nationalist insurgents, could very soon bestow on Indonesia the tragic fate of China.

Address by United States Senator Herman E. Talmadge at the Southlands Experiment Forest Dedication Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, in November of last year there was dedicated near Bainbridge, Ga., the Southlands Experiment Forest, an experimental forest and station. Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, of Georgia, made the dedicatory address.

I feel that the dedication of this unit, together with the remarks of Senator TALMADGE, will be of interest to those who are interested in the continuing development of pine forest products.

The remarks of Senator TALMADGE appear in full below:

SOUTHLANDS EXPERIMENT FOREST—DEDICATED CEREMONIES

(Remarks by United States Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE)

We all deeply regret that the inclement weather made it impossible for the Governor to fly in this morning, but I am happy, indeed, to attempt to pinch-hit for him in his absence in this dedicatory exercise.

When I drove through the forest here today from the Faceville-Bainbridge Road, I couldn't help but notice the tremendous growth of the young pine timber and think of what we had in Georgia some twenty-odd years ago, when it was a common occurrence for practically every landowner and woodland owner and farmer to burn over his woods every year. Some of them would burn them over not realizing the value or potential value of their timber. Some were trying to get early wire grass grazing for the scrub livestock that we had at that time. Some were trying to kill rattlesnakes, and some sought to kill boll weevils and some were setting timber on fire just to see the fire. We have come a long way since that time.

It was in those days that I heard a President of the United States refer to the South as economic problem No. 1 in our Nation. It was true that our per capita income in those days was only one-third of the Nation's national average, but there were a great many reasons for that.

When I became Governor of the State in 1948, the general assembly and I tried to take stock of the economic potentialities of our people.

Notwithstanding the fact that our State then ranked 46th in forest fire protection and reforestation out of the 48 States, timber and its related products brought into Georgia about \$300 million a year and gave employment to about 125,000 people.

We thought that a resource so valuable as that was well worth protecting. So we went to work to create a statewide fire-protection system and to provide adequate seedling pines for reforestation purposes. And, in less than 5 years' time, Georgia came from the 46th position in our Nation to the No. 1 position in our Nation. We now have under fire protection more than 23,500,000 acres of privately owned timberland, the greatest amount of any State in the Union.

It is interesting to compare the economic returns to our people in that short period of time. We have increased in income from forest products from \$300 million a year to about \$750 million a year at the present time. The number of people employed in forest product industries has increased from 125,000 a year to about 200,000 a year at the present time.

We still have a long way to go in Georgia. We still have a great deal of submarginal land that would be better suited to the production of pine timber than it would be lying idle or sometimes trying to grow row crops at a loss each year.

Whenever I travel over Georgia and see the acres that are still in broomsedge, see some of them that are growing up in honeysuckle, see some that are eroding and washing away into the sea, I realize the tremendous potential that we still have for the production of timber in our State.

Our farmers today have an opportunity that may not come again.

Now I refer specifically to the conservation reserve part of the so-called soil-bank law.

As many of you know, I am not too fond of the soil-bank program, but it does offer a tremendous opportunity for the conversion of some of our submarginal land to timber growth.

As you know, the Government, under the conservation reserve program, will pay about 80 percent of the cost of planting trees, plus

a rental of approximately \$8 per acre per year for a period of 10 years to take the land out of the production of crops and put it into the production of trees. And I am happy to say that our farmers are taking advantage of that program and that Georgia is leading the Nation in signing up for that program.

This year the State had applications for between 300 million and 400 million pine seedlings. These are not nearly enough to supply the demand, but the governor and the legislature are at work building new nurseries that will supply the demand, and I think the Georgia farmers and landowners next year will be able to get the seedlings they need for this program.

A few years ago I had lunch in Atlanta with one of the best experts in the paper industry. We were talking about the future potential of our State and he told me, "Governor, the use of cellulose fiber is increasing today throughout the world at a faster pace than any other commodity on earth except water."

He gave me the statistics. He cited the increased production in our own country, the increased production in the backward countries such as Russia and in Asia, and he said this, "Now, the increased production that future generations will require must be produced largely in the Northern Hemisphere."

He said, "The woods of Asia are either inaccessible or the wrong species. The same thing is largely true of Africa and South America."

He said, "Europe and the Scandinavian countries have increased about as far as they can go." Then he said, "Here on the North American Continent you must produce the future trees that will make the cellulose fiber."

He said, "Here in the South you also have a remarkable advantage because you can produce the wood 2 to 3 times as fast as it can be produced in any other section of our country."

And he said something else, "Now, when you depended upon cotton as your principal commodity, that cotton would be put in bales, it could be compressed, it could be shipped to Liverpool or Tokyo and converted there, if need be, into cloth, but whenever you produce wood cellulose fiber, the mills must come to the proximity of the source of the fiber and process it at that point. It cannot be compressed and shipped overseas."

We are fortunate today in that Georgia is producing about 14 percent of the pulpwood used in the entire United States, the largest production of any State in the southeastern area and, I believe, the largest of any State in the Union.

We have come a long way, but we are still in our infancy in the production of our timber resources. We have learned more about sound timber management in the last 10 years than we knew in the previous several hundred years. We realize now that trees planted today can be harvested within 12 to 15 years, and enormous incomes can be received from those planted trees within the life span of the man who plants the trees. That is something that we didn't know until recent years.

I am happy that you don't see the forest fires raging through our State now that you once did.

Our forestry units are efficient. They get on the scene as soon as fires are spotted and they put them out before they do much damage. That has taken the close cooperation of State, local, and Federal agencies, and, above all, there is an educational campaign that makes the people in our State realize the potential value of our woodlands that they themselves care for.

I am happy indeed that one of our largest paper companies has selected this point here in Decatur County, Ga., for an experimental forest. That is something that has long been needed.

When I was governor, the general assembly created a research council along the same lines for the same purpose. We expanded our forestry school at the University of Georgia, we reactivated and reorganized the Herty Laboratory at Savannah, Ga., that has helped point the way for the utilization of scrub hardwoods in our own State for the production of paper fiber. So now we have private industry coming in to join hands with our State agencies and with our Federal agencies, with our forestry commission, with the University School of Forestry, and they all will work together toward the selection and the development of better and superior trees.

Scientists say that there is no reason why we can't produce hybrid pine trees just as we have produced hybrid corn, and when that day comes we will be able to grow timber at a much faster pace than we do at the present time.

Now, for economic returns, I am informed by those who have grown the wood, by trained foresters and experiment stations, that our woodlands properly stocked, properly managed, properly harvested, can produce from 1 to 3 cords of pulpwood per acre per year.

I am also informed that those woods can produce anywhere from 300 to 500 boardfeet of timber per acre. That offers one of the best opportunities for economic investment, I think, that exists anywhere in our entire Nation today.

That is one of the things—our timber resources—which make the future of our State and the future of our region look so bright.

I am happy to report to you that in the last 20 years the per capita income of the people of our State and of our region has increased from less than \$300 a year to an estimated \$1,476 this year. That still does not equal the national average, but what gives us such pride in what we have accomplished and such confidence in the future is the fact that our per capita income has increased relatively twice as fast as our Nation as a whole, and if that progress continues for the next 20 years, we will equal and exceed the national average.

Forestry, of course, has played a big role in that and will play a bigger role in the future.

Now, my friends, I am happy to join with the citizens of this county, members of the legislature, the forestry commission, the visitors generally, and the officials of the International Paper Co. in dedicating this experimental forest that will be available to people throughout Georgia for recreation and education. It is another significant and important milestone that marks the progress and development of our great State.

Opposition to Lowering of Dairy Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to point out the serious effect any cutback in dairy product price supports will have on our economy. Not only will the dairy farmer be affected adversely, but also the consuming public. To express further my opposition to Secretary Benson's intended dairy product support price drop, I call attention to the following statement which I prepared for the Dairy Products Subcom-

mittee of the House Committee on Agriculture:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE J. FLOYD BREEDING (DEMOCRAT OF KANSAS) OPPOSING THE LOWERING OF DAIRY SUPPORTS, FEBRUARY 6, 1958

Mr. Chairman, members of the Dairy Products Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, first may I thank you for this opportunity to express my opposition to any reduction in the support price of dairy products.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson's recent announcement that he intends to reduce the support price of dairy products is greatly disturbing to not only the dairy product producer but also the consumer.

I, as a lifelong farmer, feel that I am quite familiar with the farm situation in this country, and I share wholeheartedly the views expressed by the National Creameries Association. The association has stated:

"This action of Secretary Benson is very ill advised. Government-held stocks are far less burdensome than in the past. All appearances point to increased disposition abroad under the foreign-aid program. While production is expected to increase, it appears that the surplus position will not be greatly affected inasmuch as the expected increase in production will be offset by population growth.

"While this reduction in manufacturing milk and butterfat support prices is taking place, the prices paid by farmers for commodities bought continues to spiral upward. The decline in purchasing power of the dairy farmer will not only work hardship on an already depressed dairy farming enterprise * * * it will affect the entire economy."

Mr. Chairman, I should like to lend my support to bills now introduced which would have the effect of preventing any drop in manufacturing milk and butterfat price support levels, presently scheduled for April 1, 1958.

Typical of communications which I have received condemning Secretary Benson's proposed dairy support cutback, is the following:

"I have been a dairy farmer for 12 years. With the high cost of material and equipment, I have failed to realize much profit in the past 3 years.

"Now, under these same conditions, our Secretary of Agriculture has recommended lowering of parity on all dairy products. * * *

"The lowering of parity would cause a critical economic situation to our Nation."

Mr. Chairman, I would like to reemphasize at this point, my opposition to any reduction in dairy supports, and my support of those measures calling for a hold-the-line support level.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to include an exceptionally comprehensive statement on this subject set forth in a letter to me from the K. M. O. Grade A Milk Producers' Association, Pittsburg, Kans.:

K. M. O. GRADE A MILK

PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,

Pittsburg, Kans., January 20, 1958.

The Honorable J. FLOYD BREEDING,
United States Representative,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BREEDING: We are deeply concerned over the possibility of a lowering in the parity to the dairy farmers of America. We are certain that some critical information was overlooked by Secretary Benson and his advisers at the time of recommendation of a lowering in parity. According to recent reports, both from the United States Department of Agriculture and from land grant colleges, some of those critical points are as follows:

1. Farmers retiring under social security: Close to 400,000 farmers have retired under

the provision of the social security program since 1946 with a little over half that number retiring in 1957. This figure represents almost 1 percent of the farm population retiring each year for the 2 years. With 16.6 percent of our farmers over 65 years of age, 20 percent between 55 and 64 and only 1.9 percent under 25, the drain on the farm population is alarming.

2. Price supports and production: During the 1953-54 period Government purchases amounted to about 8 percent of the national production at a time when milk prices had returned to a norm after Korea. During the Korea conflict of 1949 to 1952 the Government purchased an average of 1 percent per year of the national production at a time of high prices. During the last 3 years the figure has been approximately 4 percent.

In 1957 the estimate of national production was 129 billion pounds, yet only 127 billion materialized, an overestimate of almost 2 percent of the total national production.

Due to the forced delivery of milk, a highly perishable product, a limit of closer than 4 percent between actual production and use will jeopardize the provision of a necessary supply of a pure and wholesome product to the consuming public.

3. Local production: In this area of southeast Kansas and southwest Missouri our total grade A production is down from last November to this November a total of 10 percent and for October this year under October last year almost 8 percent. In addition, all manufacturing plants are paying premiums to obtain a necessary supply, and still needing milk.

In conclusion, we are aware of the necessity of a related supply of milk to the amount consumed; however, we are greatly concerned that a short supply may develop because of the parity reduction, if considered along with the dynamic effects of the cost price squeeze and the factors listed above.

Milk is one of the few foods, characterized by such necessity and general use, especially for our children, that we cannot afford to jeopardize the supply. If the supply does become jeopardized, the reduction in parity could effect not only the farmer but also the consumer as well.

We ask you to very carefully consider these and the many other factors, before taking any action on the present or future legislation on parity prices to producers.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL B. MARSHALL.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, what could be a highly sensational dramatic production is scheduled to open here next week. The setting is the hearing room of the Committee on Ways and Means. The star performers will be some members of the Cabinet and other character actors trained to keep the administration's foreign trade ball balanced to the satisfaction of Members of Congress. Methinks that there is a good chance that it is going to get knocked off a few times during the hearings, and which way it bounces is what will interest all of us.

The administration's top talent cannot exactly be programed as a novelty to be seen for the first time in this theater. Some members of the cast have been changed, and there may be a few variations in the script, but the story itself will be merely a reenactment of that adapted for presentation before the committee each time that a bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is on the docket, except that this time the audience may be much more critical than before. It is highly unlikely that any new records will be set on the applause meter following the appearances of the assorted Secretaries. As they complete their lines and take their bows, there will be some important questions that must be answered before they are permitted to slip back into the wings.

My guess is that the stars of this show would be much happier if it could be postponed until this country's economic condition begins to approach the better times talked about by the President this week. I am sure that the Secretary of State would be more at ease if he could develop an emergency that would take him into Cambodia next week. Of course, since the State Department has never shown any particular concern for the domestic economy, perhaps the Secretary is actually not too embarrassed by the unemployment report.

So long as he is able to explain that another drop in America's tariff rates will be beneficial to someone in Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, or South America, he is satisfied that there can be no disputing his arguments. For that matter, any actor who has been booed and hissed by people in all parts of the world has probably build up an immunity to reproach by elected officials of the American people.

Perhaps, then, the highlight of the administration's theatrical will be the appearance of the Secretary of Commerce. I am particularly desirous of hearing how he is going to explain the unemployment situation that has now reached supercritical proportions. It is going to take considerable audacity and arrogance on his part to ask for further tariff reductions when import competition is already responsible for so much of the joblessness now haunting the Nation. What our people would like to know is whether the administration has any definite level of unemployment in mind as the point at which it will be willing to give our working people preference over those in other countries.

For instance, how many coal miners must be put out of work by oil import competition before the executive department will make a genuine effort to cut back incoming shipments?

The Secretary of Commerce has in his office a totalizer type of apparatus which supposedly clicks every time an increase in population takes place. It has been running at a rapid rate, but it would appear that the unemployment register has been ticking at an even greater tempo. According to official Government figures, there were 4,494,000 American workers unemployed last month. Unless someone in the administration has tilted the machine, the fig-

ures are going to be even higher by the time the Secretary of Commerce gets on the stand next week.

The Secretary of Agriculture is also listed for an important role in the hearings. Here is a trouper who has become very well known to Capitol Hill, and there are many in the audience who wonder how he has been able to keep a straight face when he is pushed out on the stage to recite the administration's lines. Thackeray may have had this type of character in mind a century ago when he penned these lines for posterity:

The play is done; the curtain drops;
Slow falling to the prompter's bell;
A moment yet the actor stops,
And looks around, to say farewell.

It is an irksome word and task;
And when he's laughed and said his say,
He shows, as he removes the mask,
A face that's anything but gay.

Yes; anyone from the Rocky Mountain region who knows the value of tariff protection to domestic farms, orchards, mines, and factories would of necessity have to mask his true feelings when he portrays the part of an advocate of more liberal trade laws. It would be interesting to discover whether this gentleman would be willing to sacrifice the quota protection of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to the supranational machinery operated by a delegation of foreign mechanics in Geneva under the trademark of the Organization for Trade Cooperation. While I deplore tomato-throwing incidents such as the actor from Utah experienced during a revival service in the Dakota regions not too long ago, I can assure him that a surrender of the protection enjoyed by America's farmers against market intrusions by foreign nations would not tend to check his unpopularity in the hinterlands.

I am informed that the supporting cast will include the Secretary of Defense. The American people would like him to explain how dependence upon foreign fuels and other mobilization base ingredients can contribute to the national security. The Secretary spent many years in Cincinnati before he became a member of the Cabinet, so surely he is at least familiar with the importance of our railroad transportation system in an emergency period. From the coalfields of West Virginia and Kentucky, millions of tons of coal move across the Ohio River and into the Cincinnati yards en route North each year. When coal traffic is off, hoppers and gondolas are taken away to obscure sidings, where deterioration from exposure to the elements sets in. I do not believe that there has even been a time of sudden increases in coal demand that there has been a sufficiency of ready rolling stock to carry this fuel to market. To keep its equipment in condition, the railroad must enjoy some semblance of normal traffic movement.

Foreign residual oil has been coming into this country at a rate of some 36 million tons of bituminous coal equivalent per year. Almost all of this quantity is directly competitive with coal, but—assuming that only three-quarters of the total imports have displaced coal

on the fuel markets of the east coast—the imports would still account for a railroad traffic deficit of 27 million tons per year. To haul this coal would require the continued service of 27,270 railroad cars. Thus, in the event of a sudden cutoff of the residual oil from Venezuela and the Dutch Indies, an additional 27,270 freight cars would be required immediately for the express purpose of supplying the markets now using foreign residual oil. The Secretary of Defense knows very well that it would take many, many months to reactivate the old cars and to build the new ones needed in such an emergency. And what would affected areas do for fuel in the meantime? What about the security considerations involved?

If the Secretary is unaware of the impact that foreign oil has had on the coal mines of our Nation—and its consequent danger to the defense structure—perhaps he could stay around until the representative of the Interior Department makes his appearance at the Ways and Means hearings. Inasmuch as the Bureau of Mines is a part of Interior, the witness should be able to explain that mines which are closed may require at least a year's time to reopen. Where would the Secretary of Defense obtain coal needed in an emergency if he is willing to permit foreign competition to close our mines in the interim?

Now, then, the brilliant show which the Cabinet is putting on the road next week will, in addition, include the Secretary of Labor. The ideal staging would be for him to share the billing with the performers from Defense and Interior. When it came time to talk about closed mines and unemployed miners, the Secretary of Labor could take his cue from Interior and read off the number of the unemployed in mining communities. If a member of the Committee should ask whether it is in the best interests of national security to keep Americans at their jobs or to defer to foreigners to supply American markets, conversation could shift back to Defense. Defense does not know for sure about manpower for mines, so Interior supplies the answer. Mr. Gordon Gray, Director of Defense Mobilization, is also slated to participate, so he could fill in as the fourth member of what might be billed as the National Security Quartet. His recitation of this paragraph from the White House Report of Energy Supplies and Resources Policy would certainly bring down the House—and maybe the Senate, too:

The committee believes that if the imports of crude and residual oil should exceed significantly the respective proportions that these imports of oil bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuels situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense. There would be an inadequate incentive for exploration and the discovery of new sources of supply.

There has also been announced that the Undersecretary of the Treasury will appear in behalf of the President's trade program. Perhaps he will do the honor

of explaining how closed mines and factories and unemployed miners and other workers contribute to the monetary stability of the United States. Up here it appears that the administration is willing to run up more bills and print new money rather than to discourage unfair import competition and thereby generate more revenue for the Government; down in West Virginia we are finding it most difficult to meet the expenses of our State and local governments when such a large proportion of our workers are unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, a good attendance is assured for next week's card, but there are a lot of other Americans who would like to be there to find out how this administration attempts to justify its illogical approach to international commerce. There are at least 4,494,000 American workers who have plenty of time on their hands to follow the extravaganza. Everyone will be interested in learning how the White House representatives can possibly have the temerity to insist on continuing a policy of importing economic plague and industrial paralysis into a country where so many communities are crying for relief. Is the present panorama of shutdowns and bankruptcy and layoffs and hunger and misery not enough to make the administration admit that its trade policies need to be reassessed and revised?

See next week's drama at the hearing room in the New House Office Building.

The President Is Exploring the Idea of a Worldwide Cultural Conference—The New York Times Says, However, That This Administration "Is Not Distinguished for Intellectual Excellence"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in the debate over the shortcomings in our educational program some very interesting things have become clear, and now President Eisenhower is exploring the idea of a worldwide cultural conference to promote peace and "reap the greatest rewards from man's scientific discoveries."

Sherman Adams, speaking at the Dartmouth College national alumni dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, said the President has "asked some able people to consider how such a project might be initiated" and added—

Who is there who can say that a convocation in this country of scholars, historians, artisans, theologians, educators, sociologists, philosophers, artists and musicians—representatives of the cultural pursuits of all the human race—meeting each other in their respective groups could not suggest new and better ways for human beings to exist peaceably together and to reap the greatest rewards from man's scientific discoveries.

Well, this is certainly a long step forward. It is good to have reassurance that this administration has a deep regard for those among us who can think for themselves—our people who do not have to be spoon fed their opinions by Madison Avenue bigwigs.

It will be recalled that the term "egg-head" was coined as a term of derision and ridicule and used in the 1952 and 1956 political campaigns when the Republicans made their attack upon brains of all kinds the central point of their assault upon the Democrats and the Democratic standard bearer Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson.

This worldwide conference should be called immediately, for it will help us to get back to fundamentals in our educational program—among other things. Rear Adm. Hyman G. Rickover has pointed out that the amount of money spent for advertising in 1951 amounted to \$199 per family, while the amount spent for primary and secondary education was only \$152 per family. He said:

It may amuse you to know that the United States home permanent wave industry budgeted for research into ways of improving the looks of human hair a sum amounting to 2 cents per United States female capita. The whole Nation, meanwhile, was spending only 3 cents per capita for research into the distressing things that go on inside the human head.

WALTER LIPPMANN ON VULGARIZATION OF CULTURAL STANDARDS

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the best summary of the situation facing us today was made by Walter Lippmann who said the other day:

There is an ominous tendency in American education to teach more and more students less and less of the great disciplines which form an educated man. It is in this, more than in the ups and downs in the military balance of power, that there lies the deepest danger to our American society. We can most surely defend ourselves against conquest or domination. What we have to worry about is that with the declining level of education, with the vulgarization of the cultural standards in our mass society, we shall become a big but second-rate people, fat, Philistine, and self-indulgent.

Now I have long argued that cultural and technical exchanges, which can implement imaginative diplomacy, offer one of the major solutions to the present nuclear stalemate. A further point is that strong and imaginative leadership by the President and the Cabinet officers could greatly enhance the prospects for peace but, unfortunately, this has been noticeably lacking. It is good, therefore, to have such constructive suggestions as a worldwide cultural conference to promote peace put forward by the administration. There is an interesting irony in all this, as James Reston observed in the New York Times of February 4, 1958:

For the peoples of the Soviet Union, who were regarded here as illiterate two generations ago, are forcing the American people to take an inward look at their education and encouraging an administration that is not distinguished for intellectual excellence to concentrate on corrective measures.

I include here the New York Times report on the President's plan for a world parley of cultural leaders, and a recent speech of mine entitled "For a Revival of

Learning," which I delivered at a meeting of the Women's National Democratic Club, in Washington, D. C., on February 3, 1958:

[From the New York Times of February 6, 1958]

PRESIDENT WEIGHS WORLD PARLEY OF CULTURAL LEADERS ON PEACE—ADAMS TELLS DARTMOUTH ALUMNI

Sherman Adams, the assistant to President Eisenhower, disclosed last night that the President was considering a plan for a worldwide cultural conference to seek new and better ways for human beings to exist peaceably together.

Mr. Adams, speaking at the Dartmouth College national alumni dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, said the President last week asked some able people to consider how such a project might be initiated.

The Presidential Assistant described the proposed conference by asking this rhetorical question:

Who is there who can say that a convocation in this country of scholars, historians, artisans, theologians, educators, sociologists, philosophers, artists and musicians—representatives of the cultural pursuits of all the human race—meeting each other in their respective groups could not suggest new and better ways for human beings to exist peaceably together and to reap the greatest rewards from man's scientific discoveries?

PROPAGANDA LABEL SHUNNED

Mr. Adams added that to use these scientific discoveries man would first have to survive them.

He declared that the Government could not convene such a conference as well as citizens could convene it themselves.

"For this must be no propaganda effort or labeled as such," he explained. "It must be an undertaking by those whose contributions offer the best promise of making it a success."

Speaking specifically to the 2,200 Dartmouth alumni at the dinner, Mr. Adams asked: "What is Dartmouth's role in such a project?"

"Well, let Dartmouth answer that for herself, and her sister institutions likewise," he said. "And let other American institutions which have the capacity to make such a concept a reality think about it, too."

After the talk, Mr. Adams was asked for the names of some of the persons to whom President Eisenhower had spoken about the proposed international convocation, but he declined to elaborate.

James C. Hagerty, the White House press secretary, was quoted by the Associated Press as saying that the idea of a worldwide conference is in the exploratory and talk stage. Mr. Hagerty declined further comment.

This was the first indication that the President had shown personal interest in such a project. But last June, in West Branch, Iowa, Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, proposed a new kind of conference among nations to bring together the chief humanists of our day to seek a durable world peace.

At that time, Mr. Strauss stressed that man must learn to live with his invention or perish because of them.

The conference proposed by Mr. Strauss was one, as he described it, which starts from the knowledge of what men will lose—the accumulated treasure of culture and civilization—if the fruits of science are used for destruction.

Mr. Strauss said that the humanists who would be invited to such a conference would include the philosophers, historians, sociologists, theologians, and all the leaders of thought whose concern is with man rather than the physical universe which man is in.

The alumni dinner honored Dr. Ernest Martin Hopkins, president emeritus of Dart-

mouth College. The President's greetings and a tribute to Dr. Hopkins' principles and leadership were delivered by Mr. Adams.

FOR A REVIVAL OF LEARNING

(Remarks of Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, to the Women's National Democratic Club, Washington, D. C., February 3, 1958)

Last May the General Federation of Women's Clubs, whose District of Columbia chapter endorsed my plan for a National Cultural Center on the Mall opposite the Mellon Gallery, convened for its 66th annual meeting in Asheville, N. C. Quite important, I thought, was the report of that organization's first vice president, Miss Chloe Gifford, of Lexington, Ky. Miss Gifford said, "Let us, I beg of you, no longer eye the educated with suspicion or refer to the intelligent individual as an egghead or a high-brow."

Miss Gifford keyed her remarks to the theme of the year 1957-58 which is "Knowledge is power" and she warned that one of America's paramount dangers is "the growing loss of individualism." She also declared "Let us outgrow our lust for the mediocre." Following that fine beginning Mrs. R. I. C. Prout, national president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, told the assembled representatives of the Nation's clubwomen, "Americans have been rediscovering that the most important thing in the world is ideas with ideals."

Well, this was a long step forward. It was good to have the Nation's cultural bearers reminding us of the importance of brains and knowledge so many, many months before President Eisenhower discovered just how important they were—if indeed we can really believe that he has discovered it yet.

It will be recalled by those of you with a memory longer than the Republican elephant, that the term "egghead" was coined as a term of derision and ridicule and used in the 1952 and 1956 political campaigns when the Republicans made their attack upon brains of all kinds the central point of their assault upon the Democrats and the democratic standard-bearer Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson.

At a breakfast in Los Angeles, on September 24, 1954, President Eisenhower said, according to the press at the time:

"We had so many wisecracking so-called intellectuals going around and showing how wrong everybody is who doesn't happen to agree with them. By the way, I heard a definition of an intellectual that I thought was very interesting: A man who takes more words than are necessary to tell more than he knows."

The Republican assault on all Americans who can think for themselves, which was master-minded by General Eisenhower and carried out by the cynical opinion manipulators of Madison Avenue, was not only terrifying in the extent of the devastation and destructiveness it worked on the long proud tradition of this country and its basic regard for those among us who can think. It was terrifying in its many similarities to the attack upon the Jews by the storm troops of Hitler: lacking the violence but keeping the ghettoes.

The Republican campaign in 1956 showed that the attack on intellectuals had been refined. This time it was only intellectuals who were Democrats who were un-American. As a matter of fact, the Republicans established the Committee of the Arts and Sciences for Eisenhower headed by Helen Hayes, Irene Dunne, Robert Montgomery, Dr. Detlev Bronk, president of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council, Adm. Richard Byrd and others.

A full-page advertisement in the New York Times on October 29, 1956, announced

the formation of the new egghead committee. It opened with a quoted question attributed to Governor Stevenson's campaign managers, "We tried the 'eggheads' once. Besides, where else can they go?" The Washington Post of September 16, 1956, was given as the source. The answer given by the Committee of the Arts and Sciences for Eisenhower was that "The eggheads are going for Eisenhower."

Now Governor Stevenson's campaign managers weren't the first people to give a hasty answer or ask a question they later regretted. All of us from time to time have been stuck with something we've said. One thing about politicians which has been widely noted is that if they make many such basic errors of judgment they aren't around very long.

WHERE THE INTELLECTUALS STOOD IN 1956

We can only guess at how much of a contribution the Republican committee of the arts and sciences made to the overwhelming results of General Eisenhower's second campaign. But one thing we do know, it didn't hurt that campaign. How do I know? Why do I say this so confidently? Well, the Washington Post of September 19, 1956, reported the findings of a survey made by the Gallup poll which has its main office in Princeton, N. J., in my own district. The Gallup poll was supplemented by a special secret mail-ballot survey of leading educators, writers, artists, and scientists whose names were drawn from the latest edition of Who's Who in America. The poll showed 53 percent for Eisenhower-Nixon, 45 percent for Stevenson-Kefauver, and 2 percent undecided. The conclusion drawn by the Gallup poll was that "although it has often been assumed that one element in the population whose wholehearted support Adlai Stevenson could count on is the 'egghead vote' American intellectuals today show little inclination toward uniting solidly behind the Democratic nominee."

The 1956 campaign, like Woodrow Wilson's successful campaign of 1912, was a smashing blow to the canard that being for culture, and being for the humanities which include science and the fine arts, being for education in sum is politically risky if not political suicide. This certainly is the case at the grassroots level. For instance, take my own district where exist many institutions and agencies run by intellectually able people. I am proud of the fact that my district includes Princeton University, the Institute for Advanced Study, the Educational Testing Service, the Princeton Theological Seminary, the Westminster Choir College, the New Jersey State Library, the New Jersey State Museum, and so on. In the last campaign my opponent charged I was spending too much time on cultural matters, including the concern I have that our Nation's Capital ranks far behind most European and Russian provincial capitals in intellectual and artistic matters. Well, he got clobbered by the largest majority ever given a candidate in Mercer County where all these cultural institutions which I listed are located. As a matter of fact, New Jersey as a State has long been partial to "eggheads." President Woodrow Wilson is the leading Democratic exemplar of this fact, and there are a host of other elected New Jersey officials who could be cited as proof of this.

THE COMMITTEE FOR THE ARTS OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

The committee for the arts of the Democratic National Committee was established by that hard-bitten politician Paul Butler to counter the Republican committee of the arts and sciences for Eisenhower. Heading the Democratic committee for the arts and its cochairmen were Dore Schary, author of that new smash hit on Broadway, *Sunrise at Campobello*, about Franklin Delano Roosevelt that no one can get tickets to.

The other chairman was Cass Canfield, chairman of the board of Harper & Bros.

With the formation of these two committees a new era in American political history was begun with the arduous wooing of the once despised and reviled "egghead." Suddenly he was popular again, as he had been under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. But his popularity in the Republican Party—at the top, that is—was certainly the most startling reversal of form in politics. One thing I can say to you today is that we Democrats must face up to the fact that this administration intends to compete for the favor and the votes of the intellectual. He will never again have to walk alone, because he has learned to vote and many Republican politicians—at the top—have learned that there are votes in them that hills. But don't be discouraged and don't go selling short the appeal of the Democratic Party for the American intellectual. Just be sure that you stay in there and compete, and don't overlook the pulling power of the following major steps taken by this administration:

A PAINTER PRESIDENT

1. Certainly one of the President's major recommendations in the cultural sphere was for the establishment of a Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement. He called for this in his 1955 message on the state of the Union in the following words: "I shall . . . propose that awards of merit be established whereby we can honor our fellow citizens who make great contributions to the advancement of our civilization and of this country."

It is strange but true that there is at present no established method by which the people of this Nation can honor our great scientists, scholars, historians, theologians, educators, philosophers, artists, and musicians who are representative of the best that our civilization has to offer.

There are numerous medals established by act of Congress for our soldiers, airmen, and seamen who distinguish themselves in battle and ways have been found to honor Government employees who contribute outstandingly to our national welfare.

I was successful in having my bill providing for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement adopted by the House of Representatives. This measure, H. R. 11923, passed the House unanimously in 1956 but did not reach the Senate floor for action in the 84th Congress.

I have reintroduced my bill in the form in which it passed the House in the 84th Congress, but the President has not referred to this matter again. I am confident that with some help from the President this Congress would enact this important legislation into law.

2. The President's call for a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. President Eisenhower told the Congress in his 1955 message on the state of the Union that:

"In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Senator Lehman was successful in having the Senate pass this legislation unanimously in 1956 but only one Republican Member of the House voted for it in the House Education and Labor Committee, where it died. Representative EDITH GREEN and I are working hard to revive this measure in the House.

We would appreciate some support by the President but he seems to have lost all interest in the plan—which was widely sup-

ported by the country's cultural leaders—since Nelson Rockefeller, its author—left the Government.

3. The establishment of the President's special international program for participation in trade fairs and sending our cultural groups and individual artists overseas. This is the program Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and I developed legislation to make permanent and which the Congress enacted into law as Public Law 860, 84th Congress—the Humphrey-Thompson Act.

A. The Humphrey-Thompson Act provides the basic authority for our participation in the Brussels World Fair at Belgium. I am confident the Brussels World Fair will launch the United States on a massive program of cultural and technical exchanges which I regard as a major, and perhaps the only way out of the present nuclear stalemate.

4. The successful conclusion last week of the agreement for a fivefold increase of cultural and technical exchanges with the Soviet Union.

A. We Democrats must never forget that it was the Fulbright Act of 1944 with its greatly vital program of educational exchanges which was the precursor of the Smith-Mundt Act authored by Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH and Senator KARL MUNDT; and that the Mutual Security Act of 1954 with its technical exchanges had its origin in President Truman's point 4 speech.

These then are major contributions to the development of the foreign policy of our country and to our country's welfare. The London Economist noted the lack of progress made on the President's plan for an art commission and said that "not even a painter President has been able to induce Congress to establish [one], although it is 80 years since this idea was first proposed in a bill." Don't ask me to evaluate the quality of President Eisenhower's painting. I am not qualified to judge it, though my impression is that it doesn't measure up to Winston Churchill's works which are touring our country at this time. In fact, I'd say President Truman was a better pianist and musician than President Eisenhower is a painter. What impresses me about President Eisenhower's performance is his ability to keep so many first-rate cultural leaders in his corner, without doing anything positive to get the members of his party in the Congress to support his art commission bill. In fact he's even got the London Economist in his corner on this matter.

What President Eisenhower said about the arts in his 1955 message on the state of the Union is not remarkably different from what President George Washington said in his first annual address to the Congress on January 8, 1790. President Washington declared that "there is nothing which can better deserve our patronage than the promotion of science and literature. Whether this desirable object will be the best promoted by affording aids to seminaries of learning already established, by the institution of a national university, or by any other expedients, will be worthy of a place in the deliberations of the legislature."

NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV DECLARES WAR ON UNITED STATES

What has given education and the arts a new urgency, what has transfused the broad concept held by Washington and Jefferson that education and the fine arts are vital in a free society is the tremendous use which the Russians are putting them to in pushing that nation ahead in the race for world leadership.

I was greatly disturbed, as I know all of you were, when the Russian leader Khrushchev, some months ago on the CBS program Face the Nation, threw down the gauntlet and declared war on us in the cultural fields of education and the arts. It is for this reason that the Congress has

taken a renewed interest in such matters. The Congress has been sounding the alarm about the Russian campaign and its successes, and about its propaganda which pictures the U. S. S. R. as the seat of culture and Washington officialdom as unconcerned with the rich heritage of Western civilization except for its propaganda value. As a matter of fact, one of the telling indictments which that country makes of us is the fact that there is so little recognition of contemporary American art in the United States. Here in the capital of the free world, for instance, there is really no place as yet for the performing arts and for the display of contemporary art in any of its forms—the National Collection of Fine Arts, established in 1850 by the Congress, still doesn't have a gallery to house it despite the push which President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the Congress gave the plan in 1938 and 1939.

IN MANY AREAS OF THE WORLD A PLACE OF HONOR IS GIVEN TO THE ARTIST AND THE SCHOLAR

In many areas of the world a place of honor is given to leaders in the arts and intellectual fields and in religious activities. It is precisely in those areas where the Russian propaganda is having its deadly effect. In those countries the artist is not called a longhair, the minister of religion is not considered an impractical idealist, the intellectual is not dismissed as an egghead.

How different it is in the Capital City of our own country. In a book published in 1942 Mr. W. M. Kiplinger, a Democrat, wrote that Washington had no homegrown culture and that what culture it had was imported and pasted on. When Queen Elizabeth visited our country recently, both President Eisenhower and the Queen called for a pool of the best technological, scientific, and cultural brains in the Western world to beat the Russians. However, the widely syndicated columnist, Inez Robb, reported that not a single, solitary person distinguished in the arts and sciences was invited to attend the four glittering dinners graced by Her Majesty during her stay in Washington and given by the President, Secretary of State Dulles, and Vice President Nixon.

I would like to conclude on a hopeful note. The most hopeful note I can sound this afternoon is that, despite the ardent wooing of the Republican leaders many factors tend to cause the American intellectual to take his stand with the Democrats. For one thing, he has a long memory, and he remembers Senator McCarthy, Senator Welker, and Cohn and Schine.

A study by Paul Lazarsfeld of Columbia University shows that among academic social scientists, for instance, three-fourths are Democrats and that two-thirds voted for Stevenson in 1952. In strong Republican States colleges and universities often supply the leadership for the minority Democratic party.

Another thing, the Committee of the Arts and Sciences for Eisenhower will never become a mass movement in America or really representative of its intellectual life. It is arbitrarily limited to 500, one of its top officers told the members of Congressman Carl Elliott's Special Education Subcommittee last year. Republicans have a deep ingrained suspicion of any large number of Americans, they are interested in intellectuals who have arrived, not in those who are arriving. After Henry Ford, or Thomas Alva Edison, the Helen Hayes, and the Robert Montgomerys of our Nation have achieved national acclaim and wordly success then the Republican Party will admit them to its committee of the arts and sciences. But this committee operates just like the Mellon Gallery of Art which the Congress appropriates \$1.5 million a year to maintain. No living American painter is good enough to have his work made a part of its permanent collection. Andrew Mellon couldn't take any

chances on the artist who hadn't arrived, so he made it an ironclad rule—which our Federal Government observes to this day—that an American painter had to be dead 20 years before his work could be accepted.

They have changed the name of the Committee of the Arts and Sciences for Eisenhower to the Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Education. But I don't think this is going to help. The executive secretary is still M. Robert Rogers whose accomplishments, if any, in the fields of the arts, or the sciences, or education have escaped public notice and acclaim. Rogers made a contribution to the 1956 political campaign of considerable originality—though I have been assured by several of the officials of CASE, including Dr. Howard Hanson, that it didn't represent their point of view and that they were mystified as to whom Mr. Rogers was speaking for.

Mr. Rogers called me a culture-vulture who had little or nothing to do with the Humphrey-Thompson Act, the act giving a Congressional charter to the National Music Council, the act tripling the budget of the Commission of Fine Arts, and the act establishing the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission.

Mr. Rogers, in fact, claimed these acts and everything else in sight for the Republican Party and its standard bearers. I don't think that this convinced too many people. After all, if you can think your way to eminence in the fields of science, education, or the arts you can see through a shoddy political performance. It is my considered opinion that it will take more than campaign promises to convert any large number of American intellectuals to the Republican Party. But this is something we Democrats must remember too: We must pay more than lipservice to the arts and other cultural activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish if we are to keep the intellectuals in our corner and voting for Democratic candidates.

The Lincoln Legacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including some thoughts it was my privilege to express at the annual Lincoln Day dinner at the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, where Lincoln attended while he was President.

The address follows:

THE LINCOLN LEGACY

During the past 10 days, I have been conducting a rather novel experiment, in the form of a poll among some of the Members of Congress and those who serve on congressional staffs. I have asked each person participating in the poll to list those who were, in his opinion, the five greatest Presidents in American history.

One name appeared on every list—that of Lincoln. Jefferson was listed by all save 1, and Washington was named by all but 2. Other American Presidents prominently mentioned included Wilson, Jackson, and the two Roosevelts.

This poll left me with the inescapable conclusion, particularly from the order in which these great American Presidents were listed, that Abraham Lincoln is undoubtedly the single alltime favorite.

"What is it," I asked myself, "that makes Lincoln, even in this galaxy of greatness, stand apart from all the rest?" Several answers suggest themselves. For one thing he seems, even more than any of the others, to typify the spirit of our Nation. He could speak for the people because he was of the people. Another possible answer may lie in the fact that he overcame greater disadvantages than any of the others.

If you have viewed the grandeur of Mount Vernon, Monticello, and the Hermitage, you could not fail to be impressed with the unpretentious averageness of the Lincoln home in Springfield. Yet it is not simply that Lincoln was poor. For if his financial circumstances were so similar to those of the average American, it is because his standard of values was so different. He was poor in the sense that Christ was poor.

Every man must be judged in the framework of his environment, and his greatness is measured by the impact of his personality upon history. Yet the more we grope for the things which raised Lincoln to his distinctive pedestal of greatness, the more we are forced to conclude that his peculiar greatness was in the realm of the spirit. The attributes which were distinctively Lincoln's were remarkably those set forth by Christ in the Beatitudes.

Tonight we celebrate his birth, which in just one more year will be a full century and a half behind us.

In a crude hunter's hut, deep in Kentucky's desolate woods, it happened. On a bed of poles covered with corn husks, a cold February wind penetrating the cracks of the cabin, Abraham Lincoln was born.

What dreams dared poor Nancy Hanks Lincoln to entertain on that bleak Sunday morning of 1809, hounded by gossip and consigned by her wedding vow to share a woodsman's hardship on a barren farm that had cost 66 cents an acre? Fate, it would seem, had dealt cruelly in the extreme with Nancy Hanks, the illegitimate child of a wayward mother and an unknown father. When her mother had brought her to church as an infant one Sunday, back in Virginia, the good women of the congregation had been outraged, and one had stood up to demand in loud indignation that they be sent away. Reared by an uncle and aunt, spurned by polite society, wed to an illiterate and impoverished deerhunter, the mother of Abraham Lincoln dwelt out a miserable, sunless existence in the somber forests.

And now that she had a child of her own, the object of her adoration, could she dare to hope that his would be a better life? She died 9 years later, convulsed with pain on a wretched dirt floor pallet of leaves and bearskins. Her last words were a halting, whispered plea to Abraham and his sister—to live right, to be kind to each other, to worship God. Simple things to be remembered by a tousled, grief-stricken boy. Perhaps she knew he would not forget. What a difference it might have made to her could she but have lifted the curtain of the future and viewed the marble shrine on the Potomac which now attracts more than a million visitors a year—or could she have heard in the rustle of angels' wings the mature voice of her son as he traveled the dirt roads of Illinois a third of a century later and said to his friend, Billy Herndon, "God bless my mother; all that I am or ever hope to be, I owe to her."

Life was never easy for Lincoln. God has a way of making men wander in the wilderness until they are ready for His designs, and the shape of great character is often hammered out on the anvils of sacrifice and suffering. Lincoln could speak the deathless masterpiece at Gettysburg because he had experienced Gettysburgs of his own.

"Blessed are the poor in spirit," said Christ, "for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

Abraham Lincoln was dogged by defeat, hounded by failure, stalked by tragedy. From the loss of his mother at the age of 9, grief followed his footsteps like an unshakable shadow. The idyllic youthful love he shared with Ann Rutledge ended in abiding heartache. For weeks he aimlessly stumbled in solitude along the banks of the Sangamon, where they had shared their dreams or stood in moody silence beside her grave in the Concord Cemetery until his friends actually despaired of his sanity. Later, in Springfield, he was to know the unspeakable anguish of the death of his little boy, Eddie, at the age of 4, and, still later, as President and while a regular attendant of this church, the death of his beloved son, Willie, and to sit for hours in melancholy reverie, his body wracked by uncontrollable sobs. Because he loved deeply, he felt these experiences deeply.

But "blessed," said Christ, "are those that mourn."

In New Salem, Lincoln failed in business, fell deep in debt, had a legal judgment lodged against him. Finally, he left town for Springfield on a borrowed horse, and there felt the frustration of repeated political defeats.

Yet, defeat did not sour into defeatism; failure did not produce self-pity; grief did not become bitterness. There was a redeeming sense of humor, often the despair of his wife, but the product of genuine humility, which forbade him to take himself too seriously. So that when Douglas poked ridicule at his gangling frame by asking how long a man's legs should be, he could reply that they should be "long enough to reach the ground." And when Douglas hurled devastating accusations at him and charged him with being two-faced, Lincoln could spread his hands to the audience, and say, "Now, I ask you: if I had two faces, would I be wearing this one?"

Yet this was not enough to win for him the coveted Senate nomination. When the race was over and again he had lost, he remembered the crowds which had flocked to hear the debates of the campaign and decided that he might make a bit of money now to pay his debts by giving lectures. He carefully prepared a talk, rented a hall in Bloomington, stationed a young lady at the door to sell tickets, and not one solitary person came to hear him—not one.

At the age of 49 (just a century ago this year), he confessed, "With me the race of political ambition has been . . . a flat failure." A newspaper lamented editorially that Hon. Abe Lincoln is undoubtedly the most unfortunate politician who has ever attempted to rise in Illinois.

This is the man. This is the man who was strangely catapulted into the Presidency at probably the most critical moment in the Nation's history. I think it not an irreverence to say that this was the hour for which God had been preparing Abraham Lincoln.

Even in the White House, however, he seemed at first doomed to mediocrity, even failure. His cherished dream had been to forge a peaceful settlement of the differences which existed between North and South, thus to avert war and save the Union without bloodshed. But before he could even take the oath of office, he saw this dream dissolve before his eyes, the bands of union crumple and ignite. Six weeks after his election, South Carolina passed an ordinance of secession, and in rapid order 6 other States did the same.

All the while the outgoing administration of Buchanan, honeycombed with disloyalty, did nothing whatever to prevent all this. Lincoln was obliged to sit helplessly in Springfield for 3 months, to see the South buying guns and building forts and drilling soldiers. Two days before he left Springfield to assume the burdens of the Presidency, half of the Nation had declared itself out, set up a new government and finalized its action by electing Jefferson Davis President of the Confederacy founded upon what was

called the great truth * * * that slavery is the Negro's natural and normal condition.

There is a popular misconception about why the Civil War was fought. Ask the average American what it was all about, and the chances are he would tell you that it was fought to free the slaves. This was, undoubtedly the most important byproduct of that war. Yet the great historic lesson established by the Civil War is that this is a Federal Union, not a Confederacy. The Civil War was fought to prove that a State could not secede, that this was and would remain in truth "One nation, indivisible."

As to Lincoln's personal feelings about slavery, there can be no doubt. Because of his innately sympathetic heart, the spectacle of one human being owned as property by another did violence to his sense of right and wrong.

Herndon has preserved the story of Lincoln's trip to New Orleans as a young man where for the first time he beheld the true horrors of human slavery. Against the essential inhumanity of human creatures in chains, whipped and scourged, his conscience rebelled. Then and there he swore an oath against the cruel and heartless institution. For it was wrong and it reeked of evil.

"Blessed are the pure in heart," said Christ, "for they shall see God."

But above his distaste for slavery, Lincoln's greater passion was to save his Nation. With the vision of the pure hearted, he knew that if States were allowed to secede, there would be no United States. In time there would have been no Confederacy either, in all likelihood. The precedent of dissolution could have been fatal, not only to the Nation but to the hemisphere and to Western civilization. Had it been allowed to go unchallenged, one State after another, plucked over some real or imagined wrong, or on a quixotic whim, could have solemnly declared its independence of the others.

Today, had the Confederacy triumphed and the right of secession been established, this land of the free could have been an American equivalent of the Balkans, composed of many weak and powerless individual nations, the easy prey of armed might and military dictatorship. Can the most ardent southerner, in honest introspection, fail to utter a fervent prayer of thanksgiving to God that Lincoln and the Union emerged triumphant?

Still, Lincoln was a peaceful man, not a warmonger. Every vital fiber of his being cried out against the wanton slaughter that made its glories out of women's tears. He believed that the North was as much responsible for the existence of slavery as was the South, and that both sections should bear equally the burdens of its elimination. The fanatic abolitionists rallied against him and called him a compromiser. It was easy for them to demand a radical course of action when they personally could lose nothing from the cataclysmic economic dislocations it would create. Lincoln, however, thought also of the South and of simple justice to that region which made war against him and which hated him with a universal loathing.

Finally he worked out a plan that was very near to his heart. Lincoln proposed that the slaveholders beginning in the loyal border States would be fairly recompensed by the Government, paid \$400 for each of their Negroes. The slaves would be emancipated gradually. It would have been infinitely less costly to both sides than continuation of the war. In the Lincoln Parlor of this church is the original draft, in the President's own handwriting, of a bill to bring this about. Calling the Representatives of these States to the White House, he summoned all his eloquence to urge this settlement upon them.

"The change it contemplates," he pleaded, "would come gently as the dews of heaven,

not rending or wrecking anything. Will you not embrace it? So much good has not been done by one effort, in all past time, as in the providence of God it is now your high privilege to do. May the vast future not have to lament that you neglected it."

But neglect it they did. They summarily rejected the entire plan. The President was terribly disheartened. Lincoln, the peacemaker, had failed.

But "Blessed are the peacemakers," said Christ, "for they shall be called the children of God."

Left no other alternative, the President proceeded to gird the Union for all-out war. He proclaimed the emancipation of the slaves, armed the Negroes, and devoted his singular energies to the gory and distasteful business of destroying the enemy. All southern ports were closed by the Navy in the most sweeping blockade ever theretofore engineered. This was total war, and the steel fingers of economic strangulation began to tighten about the throat of the South. It was either this or surrender the Union and assent to the death and burial of the United States.

Gloom hung heavy in the North, also, and in the White House. Lincoln's generals failed him, his Cabinet snubbed him, the public reviled him, even his wife is said to have held him in contempt. A nation at war was in no mood to embrace Christian charity—and it was this of which Lincoln was made.

The abuse he suffered would have made any ordinary man strike back in wounded pride. When the inept McClellan showed his contempt both in private and in public for the President, Lincoln offered to hold his hat. When Salmon P. Chase humiliated him and plotted against him, Lincoln praised Chase and made him Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. After Frederick Stanton had scorned him as an "imbecile" and a "gorilla," Lincoln made Stanton his Secretary of War.

"Blessed are the meek," said Christ, "for they shall inherit the earth."

When the North, finally tasting victory, would mete out a vindictive full measure and more to the prostrate South, Lincoln, too big for vengeance, proposed again that the Southern States be helped financially by the Union to recover from their costly losses. Not one member of his Cabinet would agree.

When the war was finally over and Lee met Grant at Appomattox Court House, there were no humiliating ceremonies of capitulation. There was to be no vengeance such as that demanded by the northern radicals who for 4 years had been insisting that Lee and others be hanged for treason. The terms of surrender were remarkably generous and gentle. Why? Because Abraham Lincoln, just hours before his death, had personally dictated those terms.

"Blessed are the merciful," said Christ.

The psychiatrists say that some actions are motivated by love, others by hate. The latter seems to have been completely foreign to the Lincoln character. The basic Lincoln philosophy seems to have been expressed, perhaps best of all, in the moving cadences of his second inaugural address. I think it is the most profoundly Christian utterance ever spoken by a head of state. If you haven't read it lately, it will bear thinking through again—slowly—while remembering that these words were uttered at a moment when all about him was raging the hot hatred of war.

"Neither party expected of the war the magnitude or the duration which it has already attained. * * * Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God, and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any man should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces,

but let us judge not, that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered. That of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has His own purpose.

"If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South this terrible war as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said, 'The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.'

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

"Blessed," said Christ, "are those that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be satisfied."

In the end, Lincoln had done that which he had set out to do. Over the most difficult obstacle course to confront a career, he had fulfilled his mission. And in the end, even Stanton and Seward and those who had begun by holding him in such bitter contempt, had learned to respect and revere him. After the assassin's bullet had pierced his head and while he lay in the little roominghouse across from Ford's Theater, it remained for Stanton, his former detractor, to speak the fitting tribute: "There lies the most perfect ruler of men the world has ever seen * * * (and) now he belongs to the ages."

Lincoln does belong to the ages. The plea of poor Nancy Hanks was not in vain. The legacy she bequeathed has enriched the Nation and the world. It was the patience, the humility, the Christian charity with which she imbued her son that did, in the final analysis, save the Union.

And what of his legacy to that Union? What of his legacy to us?

In a day when men of lesser stature appeal to fear and hatred, to fanaticism and emotionalism, fanning the embers of mistrust to divide class against class, race against race, section against section, have we collectively as a nation and a people the patience and the charity to understand one another's point of view, to elevate the Nation's welfare above our own petty prejudices and personal predilections, to work out in a spirit of tolerance those peaceful solutions which can once more save the Union?

In a time when others, less fortunate than ourselves, look to our shores and yearn for freedom, have we the sympathetic mercy to wish it for them, the unselfishness to realize that freedom is not a thing of short supply to be hoarded for fear others in gaining it would leave us poorer, but to know that freedom is a blessing, a gift of God, and that, as in all blessings, its enjoyment comes in the sharing of it?

In an age when the world is divided in a titanic ideological struggle between two opposing ways of life, when in Lincoln's words it might again be said that "this generation will nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth," have we the bigness of spirit to turn aside from hatred and to overcome the adversary with an offensive of love?

If we do possess these qualities as a nation today, then we may truthfully say that we in our time are the continuing heirs of the Lincoln legacy.

There are no words we may speak to do proper honor to such a man as Lincoln. What then can we do? The answer might be found in his own admonition, for to paraphrase him:

"It is better for us, the living, to be here dedicated to the unfinished work remaining before us. . . . That from this honored life we take increased devotion to that cause for which he gave his last full measure of devotion. . . . That we here highly resolve that this great life shall not have been lived in vain. . . . That this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom. . . . And that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Speech of Hon. Clifford Davis, Member of Congress, Before the National Capital Section, American Society of Civil Engineers, Washington, D. C., February 11, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, this past Tuesday, February 11, our colleague, Representative CLIFFORD DAVIS, of Memphis, Tenn., delivered a most impressive talk on the United States Army Corps of Engineers and our Federal public works program, and I felt it should be called to the attention of the Members of the House.

Although the talk reviewed a period of many years of history, and ranged through a broad cross section of the many varied types of public works, it was a concise, succinct, and a logical presentation of what is usually a very large and unwieldy area of subject matter. Only one with intimate familiarity in this whole field of public works could have made such an effective, comprehensive, and yet clear and concise presentation. As chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee, Mr. DAVIS was responsible for the major share of the public works omnibus bill now pending.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD the talk by Representative DAVIS follows:

SPEECH OF HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE THE NATIONAL CAPITAL SECTION, AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS ANNUAL DINNER AT THE SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 11, 1958

Mr. President, General Itschner, ladies, and gentlemen, Mrs. Davis and I are very grateful to you for your kind invitation to join you at your annual dinner. Both of us have great respect for your profession.

It was very gracious of General Itschner to introduce me tonight. All of you know he is our country's chief engineer officer and a most distinguished one.

UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The Corps of Engineers dates from June 16, 1775, when the Congress authorized Gen. George Washington to appoint a Chief Engineer for the Army. Since that day the Army has been served by 40 Chief Engineers down to Major General Itschner. As subcommittee chairman of the House Public Works Committee, and long before, I have had an opportunity to observe and appreciate the integrity, the efficiency, and the worthiness of this great corps.

Much has been written about the accomplishments of the Army engineers. Their exploits in every war in which our country has engaged are history. Their work on behalf of river and harbor improvements and flood control has been extensively commented upon.

It is not generally known, however, that the Army engineers have been responsible for a variety of other achievements that have paced the Nation's progress. Successive administrations and Congresses have looked to the Army engineers as the logical group of trained personnel to accomplish unusual pioneering missions. The Army engineers, in the spirit of their motto: "Let us try," undertook each and every one of these assignments with traditional thoroughness and vigor.

In the early days of the country's history, Army engineers conducted nearly all preliminary explorations. They made surveys, prepared maps, constructed roads, built bridges and developed canals—all essential to opening up new territories. These missions, and their effective accomplishment, were part of the colorful saga of American civilization as it pushed westward across the rivers, prairies, and mountains. Army engineers initiated most of the accurate methods now employed by the Government in geodetic, topographic, and hydrographic surveys as they surveyed and marked practically every boundary of the United States and most of the State lines.

While the Army engineers were helping to build a new country, they were also helping to give America a well-planned and beautiful Capital City. An Army engineer of the Revolutionary period, Pierre L'Enfant, drew the plans for the Nation's Capital, and Army engineers have had a conspicuous part in planning and building Washington's public buildings and structures.

Until I did some research I did not know that the construction of the Washington Monument was completed by the Army engineers. Army engineers also built the great wings and magnificent dome of the Capitol. They built the beautiful Library of Congress, the old Post Office Building, the new Municipal Building, the Government Printing Office, the War College, and the Department of Agriculture Building. They supervised construction of the Lincoln Memorial, and practically all the park system in the District of Columbia. The Washington Aqueduct, until recent years, the longest single archstone bridge in the world, is a monument to the Corps of Engineers and its operation continues under corps supervision. In the Greater Washington area, Army engineers constructed the Pentagon, largest office building in the world.

An outstanding example of how the country has turned to the Army engineers to accomplish unusual and extremely difficult undertakings is the construction of the Panama Canal.

Facilities for the development of perhaps the most important project of our time—the atom bomb—were constructed by the Army engineers. This unprecedented undertaking was primarily a cooperative accomplishment of science in the development of atomic energy and of engineers in providing the necessary facilities—without which the bomb could not have been produced.

And now when we are moving so quickly in the world in conquering and understanding outer space, it was the Army who successfully fired the satellite, Explorer.

I could go on in recital of all that the Engineers have meant to the country in its long history of accomplishments. Time does not permit a further review, but I should like to remind you that the present Bureau of Roads evolved from the work of the Corps of Engineers in roadbuilding, notably construction of the Cumberland Road. The roads in Yellowstone, Mount Rainier, and Crater Lake National Parks were built by the Army engineers. The old Virginia Highway, laid out between 1840 and 1850, was under the supervision of the first professor of engineering at West Point. The Alaska Road Commission, under the supervision of the Engineers, built thousands of miles of wagon and sled roads.

Contributions to the Territories and possessions of the United States by Army engineers are substantial. They not only surveyed and constructed the roads but built communication systems, laid out sanitary systems, and developed the harbors, changing the entire economy of these areas.

PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAMS

In these days when we recognize the importance of balancing our military security with the development of our natural resources and the maintenance of a sound economy, we must discuss for a moment a few current programs.

There have been suggestions and indeed bills have already been introduced to provide huge sums for public works to maintain employment in the face of approximately 4½ million unemployed men and women in the country today.

We already have a public works program and, if supported by appropriations immediately, it will do the job.

1. OMNIBUS BILL

I submit, to you thoughtful engineers, that the omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill, now before the House, should be passed without delay. Our Public Works Committee feels that there is an urgent need for this bill at this time.

In the closing days of the last session, the omnibus bill, now substantially before the House in the same form, was vetoed by the President on the grounds that it did not meet, in many instances, objections of the Bureau of the Budget. I can tell you now that this omnibus bill, authorizing projects in the sum of \$1,456,000,000 now meets the Budget Bureau's objections within 3 percent.

The bill contains projects and authorizations whose need has been made clearly evident by the last 3 major flood disasters: (1) The hurricanes and floods of 1955, which left such a widespread path of destruction through the New England and Middle Atlantic States, (2) the unprecedented rainfall and floods in California and adjacent States during the Christmas holidays of 1955, which brought suffering and heartache to many families during this traditionally joyous season, and (3) the floods throughout the Southwest United States during May and early June of last year.

Our committee feels that it would be appropriate to refute the argument often advanced that because of the large backlog of civil works projects no more should be authorized at this time. Even the most cursory consideration will make it obvious that the civil works program cannot be static. Like most human endeavors, it must be treated as a flexible undertaking, subject to modification and additions as conditions warrant. Floods are no respecter of priority of authorization, and any philosophy which says that all meritorious projects now authorized should be constructed before any new ones

are considered ignores the nature of physical phenomena, the meaning of the civil works program, and indeed logic itself.

I have long believed that we should have plans and signs for public works generally in every level of government, municipal, State, and Federal. They should be on the shelves ready for use in time of special need.

2. INTERSTATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Many of you have heard that our big interstate road program is being unduly delayed. We passed a bill which originally involved an expenditure on the part of the Federal Government of approximately \$27 billion, covering the big, Interstate Defense Highway System. To pay for the system, this figure has now reached the sum of \$37 billion in the face of a reevaluation of all of the costs involved.

In this next year, \$2 billion was to be allotted from the trust fund to continue the program. As you know, this trust fund arises from taxes on gasoline, diesel oil, and certain excise taxes which are committed to this stupendous road-building program. The actual revenue, unfortunately, has not yet reached the estimate, and it is thought that the best that can be spent out of the trust fund in the next year will be about \$1,600,000,000.

In fiscal year 1960, the sum of \$2,200,000,000 was to be allocated and, of course, only time will know how much below that sum the actual revenue will be.

This, in and of itself, is a big public works program. Indeed, it is the biggest in our Nation's history.

When the States contribute 10 percent of the cost, the present estimated value of these public works will be in round figures \$41 billion. At the same time the States are undertaking an accelerated program on the primary, secondary, and urban roads, wherein they contribute 50 percent of the total cost. A great amount of time is now being taken in the acquisition of rights-of-way and planning, and you know better than I how necessary it was to increase the engineering potential required.

3. WATER-POLLUTION CONTROL

The control of stream pollution, comparatively new to our country, is growing in importance. Under the public law the Federal Government may make a contribution of 30 percent of the cost of a single project but, in no instance, may the amount exceed \$250,000. This has greatly stimulated the planning and design of water and sewage-treatment plants.

In certain sections of our country, there is a very definite shortage of water. We must use and reuse it. It would be a serious mistake not to continue Federal participation in encouraging States and municipalities to go forward. The recommendation made to abandon Federal participation in 1960, is certainly not to the best interest of the country.

4. PUBLIC BUILDINGS

We passed a lease-purchase plan to encourage the erection of Federal office buildings. In brief, we thought that private investors would be interested in constructing these projects which would be paid for over a maximum period of 25 to 30 years by the Federal Government. We provided that the property should remain on local tax rolls and would be a great impetus in supplying much-needed public construction. Thus far, the administration of the act has been disappointing. Private capital has just not been interested.

The House Appropriations Committee has suggested that, if this program is not soon off the ground in a substantial way, the committee would be inclined to appropriate some \$300 million to \$500 million a year to do the job. This, I hope, will result.

5. PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING

We now have a Federal assistance program providing interest-free loans to local governments for the planning of public works projects. Emphasis is on preliminary engineering plans.

We have public facilities loans which are made to State and local governments for building essential community facilities where they are not otherwise available on reasonable terms and conditions. These loans must be of sound value and so secure as to reasonably assure retirement or repayment. Applications from communities of less than 100,000 having an urgent and vital need receive priority consideration.

And there is the urban planning assistance program, wherein grants are made to defray one-half of the cost of planning work in communities under 25,000 population, or for work in metropolitan and regional urban areas. It also provides grants to official metropolitan and regional planning agencies for work in metropolitan and regional urban areas. In addition, grants may be made to local governments or to official State planning agencies for work in major distress areas, as well as help to official planning agencies for work in areas threatened with rapid urbanization under the impact of a Federal installation.

I hope I have given you, though sketchily, a summary of the programs now provided by law—all of which should be maintained with all speed and appropriations.

We must keep our country militarily and economically strong. We have the resources, the wealth, and the genius to do just that.

Recently, General Itschner gave us information that the Russians were stepping up their river and harbor and flood control and power projects. While they have not yet reached the high standards of efficiency enjoyed by our own country, we do know that they are going forward in their domestic affairs in the same threatening fashion that they seem to be excelling in certain military phases. Surely, our country can maintain a public works program of real magnitude and at the same time under positive, confident leadership not only catch up with our enemy but surpass him in all things militarily.

The important governments of the world are headed by few men. Most of those men and the governments they represent do not have the same high principles that we have long enjoyed in our country. Too true, many of them are led by a godless philosophy which we know as communism.

In all sincerity, I am convinced that we must reevaluate our own national dependence upon a higher power than that controlled by man.

Doing Business in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and may I say, too, the Congress of the United States, is very fortunate indeed to have the Honorable A. FERNÓS-ISERN as Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico. He has spent almost 12 years discharging the obligations of this important office, and of course with each succeeding year his services become more valuable to all of us.

Dr. FERNÓS is possessed with unlimited knowledge about his people and with his recognized ability and industry, together with the confidence which his people place in him, he has been able to render to them outstanding service.

Just recently there was held in New York City a briefing conference on the subject of doing business in Puerto Rico. The Resident Commissioner was honored to give the address of welcome to those attending this conference. His address is a fine, up-to-date statement of the history of this part of our Nation and the important part that it and its people are playing in our national life today. I take great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in placing Dr. FERNÓS' address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all of us may read it and have profit therefrom.

ADDRESS BY HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO IN WASHINGTON, D. C., AT THE DOING BUSINESS IN PUERTO RICO CONFERENCES HELD ON FEBRUARY 6 AND 7 AT THE HOTEL COMMODORE IN NEW YORK CITY

Gentlemen, allow me to thank you for having accepted the invitation of the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., and the Puerto Rico Economic Development Administration, to attend this conference. I thank you in the name of the people of Puerto Rico, whom I represent in the Federal Government. As I am sure you know, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico is the elected representative of the people and serves for a term of 4 years. He is the spokesman for the people of Puerto Rico in Federal matters. The position exists since 1900 and was created by the first organic act which organized civil government in Puerto Rico under American sovereignty. The fact that you are here, and that you are giving so much of your precious time to become acquainted with the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and its opportunities, attests to your interests in the islands and its people. (The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico comprises the island of Puerto Rico and a number of small adjacent islands, two of which are inhabited and organized as municipalities within the Commonwealth.)

I believe I owe you a short résumé of the background of the islands comprised within the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and of its people. As you may remember, the first area of the New World which came in contact with western civilization was the Caribbean. The first settlement in the New World, and for that matter the first capital of the New World, was established before the end of the 15th century in the island then known as Hispaniola and now occupied jointly by the Dominican Republic and the Republic of Haiti. From what is now the Dominican Republic discovery and conquest branched out. Puerto Rico was the second island to be conquered and settled; therefore, its capital city, San Juan de Puerto Rico, is the second oldest city in the New World. It was founded by the first settler of Puerto Rico, Juan Ponce de Leon, in 1508. Cuba, Mexico, Costa Firme, Peru, followed. Exactly 99 years after San Juan was founded the English King awakened to the fact that there was a New World and there was plenty of room in it, not only for Spaniards, but also for Englishmen. Jamestown was founded.

Therefore, by the time Jamestown was founded, western civilization was 99 years old in Puerto Rico. During the succeeding centuries, up to the end of the 19th century, a continuous stream of settlers moved over from Spain to the New World, and consequently, into Puerto Rico. And in those four centuries Puerto Rico grew into a people a million strong, with no less than

66 cities and towns, or municipalities, and with no more free land for settlement. Until the middle of the 19th century, when various separate kingdoms merged to give rise to the unified Spanish State, Puerto Rico was a part of the Kingdom of Castile, one of the component parts of Spain, and lived under the Laws of Indies, which means the laws of Castile in a modified form, in order to adjust to New World conditions. After Spain became a united kingdom with a constitution and a common code of laws, Puerto Rico was declared to be a component part of that kingdom. Since 1868 Puerto Rico was duly represented in the Spanish Cortes, the national parliament.

The ethnic composition of the people of Puerto Rico is, therefore, fundamentally Spanish. The Indians very early disappeared as a race. There were about 16,000 Indians at the time of the discovery and conquest and they were soon absorbed both by the white race and by the colored race which was brought into the island from the early days of settlement. Slavery existed in Puerto Rico until 1873 when the 33,000 slaves were declared free citizens. Their masters were paid the proper indemnity.

To say that Puerto Rico was a part of the kingdom of Spain is to express a political fact, but the political fact did not quite conform with social realities. Thousands of miles of water between the island and the peninsula made for such differences of interest and outlook, that even with a common origin, a common culture, and a common language, there were profound differences which subjected the existing political relationship to strains and tensions which found expression in the claim for self-government by the island people.

This came to fruition in the year 1897 when the Spanish crown granted a self-governing constitution to the people of Puerto Rico, with the participation of Puerto Rico in the decisions which concerned their external affairs as well as representation in the national parliament. National matters were still in charge of the central government. What the outcome of this arrangement might have been, had it lasted, is anybody's guess. Mine is that separation from Spain was inevitable and that the Spanish-American War, as a result of which Puerto Rico was separated from Spain and its sovereignty transferred to the United States, must be interpreted as a shortcut in history. By virtue of this separation Puerto Rico ceased to be a part of a European kingdom and became, in the political sense, what it had always been and is in the geographic and social sense, a people of the New World.

The determination of the political status of the Puerto Rican people after separation was not made by the Treaty of Cession. The Treaty of Cession, the Treaty of Paris of 1899, left the determination of the political status of the Puerto Rican people to the Congress of the United States. Following the termination of the Spanish regime, Puerto Rico was placed under a military government for 2 years. In 1900 the Congress enacted the First Organic Act for Puerto Rico and civil government was restored. The Organic Act of 1900 provided for the people of Puerto Rico raising their own taxes and paying for their own internal government, while the Federal Government would have direct charge of external matters and what we all know as Federal functions and services. It provided for the extension of the United States tariff to Puerto Rico, as imposed to foreign imports, and for the accession of Puerto Rico to the common market of the United States. The basic relationship still exists at present, except for the limitation on the amount of refined sugar Puerto Rico may ship to the mainland.

The Organic Act of 1900 also provided for American currency to be the currency of Puerto Rico, and for the extension to Puerto

Rico of the United States postal system. No Federal taxes would be collected in Puerto Rico. (This situation still exists except for the limited application of the Federal income-tax law. Residents of Puerto Rico are now subject to the Federal income-tax law on income derived from sources outside Puerto Rico. This includes Federal salaries earned in the island.)

Practically the whole tax field was left to the island's government and, since 1917, its income from revenues collected includes that tax on goods produced or manufactured in Puerto Rico and transported to the United States market. The tax is equal in amount to that imposed in the United States on United States domestic products. Puerto Rico was to be represented in the Federal Government by a Resident Commissioner who was also granted all the privileges of the House of Representatives, except a vote. The Government of Puerto Rico was organized with a Governor appointed by the President of the United States, a bicameral legislative assembly, and a supreme court. The upper house, of the legislative assembly, the executive council, was composed of 11 members appointed by the President. The house of delegates was elected by the people. Out of the 11 members of the executive council, 6 were at the same time respectively the heads of the 6 departments of the executive branch of Government.

Puerto Rico lived under the Organic Act of 1900, known as the Foraker Act, for 17 years. In 1917 Congress enacted a new organic act known as the Jones Act. The executive council was replaced by an elected senate. Four of the heads of the six executive departments were to be appointed by the Governor by and with the advice of the Senate of Puerto Rico. The Governor, the auditor, and the two remaining heads of departments, namely the attorney general and the commissioner of education, were still appointed by the President. The justices of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico were appointed by the President, while the judges for the inferior courts were appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate of Puerto Rico. Appeals from the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico were to be made to the First Federal Circuit Court of Appeals at Boston and thence to the Supreme Court of the United States. A Federal district court, which had been previously created for the district of Puerto Rico, was continued.

The Jones Act, the Organic Act of 1917, was not substantially amended for 30 years. In 1947 it was amended to provide for an elective Governor and for the appointment by the Governor of all the heads of departments. The auditor and the supreme court continued to be appointed by the President of the United States.

A fundamental change in the government of Puerto Rico took place in 1950. Public Law 600, of the 81st Congress, was signed by the President on July 3, 1950. I had the honor of having introduced the bill in the House, while it was introduced in the Senate by Senators O'MAHONEY and BUTLER of Nebraska. The act, which was adopted in the nature of a compact and was to become effective if accepted in a referendum by the people of Puerto Rico, was in fact an enabling act to allow the people of Puerto Rico to organize their own government under a constitution of their own adoption, within the framework of relationships as Public Law 600 offered the people of Puerto Rico. They approved, 4 to 1, the terms of compact. Accordingly, they elected delegates to a constitutional convention to frame a constitution for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. I had the honor of presiding over that convention. The constitution framed by the constitutional convention was submitted to the people of Puerto Rico for

approval or rejection, and they approved it by popular vote on March 3, 1952. Under Act 417 of July 3, 1952, 82d Congress, the Congress of the United States declared the constitution adopted by the people of Puerto Rico to be in conformity with the compact, and approved it, subject to some conditions subsequently approved by the people of Puerto Rico. Thereupon the Commonwealth was inaugurated on July 25, 1952, on the 54th anniversary of the landing of American troops in Puerto Rico under General Miles on July 25, 1898.

In accordance with the compact, the constitution of Puerto Rico creates the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The constitution contains a bill of rights and provides for a republican form of government, with three branches of government, namely, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. The Governor is elected by the people every 4 years. The Governor appoints the council of secretaries, with the advice and consent of the senate. There is a unified judicial system and a legislative assembly consisting of a senate and a house of representatives elected by popular vote every 4 years together with the Governor and the Resident Commissioner. The bill of rights is patterned after the Bill of Rights in the United States Constitution. A unique feature of the Constitution of Puerto Rico is that it provides for representation of the minority parties, roughly proportionate to their voting strength, regardless of the number of districts they may have carried.

Under the compact the United States Government operates in Puerto Rico within a sphere of authority comparable to that within which it operates in the United States, except the exercise of the taxing power. The government of the Commonwealth operates in Puerto Rico within a comparable sphere of authority as a State government, although the field in which it exercises its taxing power is broader than in a State. The other main difference between the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and a member State of the Union is to be found in the fact that Puerto Rico has no participation in the election of the President of the United States, has no representation in the Senate of the United States and is represented in the House by a voteless Resident Commissioner. Federal laws apply in Puerto Rico, with a few exceptions, with the same force and effect as in the United States. Appeals of decisions of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico are still made to the first circuit court. A United States district court continues to function in Puerto Rico.

Since 1917, under the Jones Act, the citizens of Puerto Rico were declared to be citizens of the United States. Common citizenship has been now for 41 years the fundamental bond of Union between the people of Puerto Rico and the people of the United States and, although those living in 1917 became citizens under collective naturalization, the fact is that more than half of the present population of Puerto Rico, the younger generations, are United States citizens by birth.

Within this framework of political and economic relationship to the United States, Puerto Rico is at present rapidly developing as a free community, permanently associated to the United States. While maintaining its historical and cultural heritage, it has assimilated and incorporated into its life the ideals, the outlook, the ways of American life. Puerto Rico is rapidly becoming bilingual. It is a hubbub of industrial activity. It is inevitably destined to become the outpost of American industry and commerce in the Caribbean, the frontier of American business, vis-a-vis the chain of countries that border the Caribbean Sea; countries that are now undergoing an upsurge of commercial activity and for whom I venture to predict Puerto Rico shall become the workshop. Millions of prospective consumers of the product of

American enterprise, ingenuity and know-how live on the Caribbean basin and beyond, into the vastness of the Spanish-American Main.

With the weapon of a common language, both with the people of the United States and the people of the Caribbean, and with the stability derived from our American institutions, I venture to say that Puerto Rico will become the industrial leader of that area; again I say, the outpost and spearhead of American business and the American spirit in that part of the world.

Dedicatory Prayer Breakfast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 13, 1958

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last Thursday morning 1,000 persons, including the Vice President, members of the Cabinet, the courts, Members of the Senate, Members of the House of Representatives, Government officials, delegates to the conference, and representatives of the Council of Christian Leadership groups attended the Presidential prayer breakfast at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the program and transcript of the proceedings of this service.

In my opinion, this prayer breakfast, attended by outstanding leaders in every field, will add much to the religious life of our Nation.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM FOR PRESIDENTIAL BREAKFAST, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1958, 8 A. M., MAYFLOWER HOTEL

Presiding: Hon. FRANK CARLSON, United States Senate, president, International Council for Christian Leadership.

Invocation: The Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, and general conference chairman.

Breakfast.

Message of welcome: Senator CARLSON.

Reading of the Old Testament (Isaiah 12: 2-6): The Honorable William J. Brennan, Jr., United States Supreme Court.

Reading of the New Testament (Ephesians 1: 3-14): The Honorable Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of the Treasury.

Greetings from the House of Representatives breakfast group: The Honorable L. H. FOUNTAIN, Congressman from North Carolina, and chairman of the House of Representatives breakfast group.

Greetings from the Senate breakfast group: The Honorable JOHN STENNIS, Senator from Mississippi, and chairman of the Senate breakfast group.

Introduction of the guests at the head table: Senator CARLSON.

Prayer of dedication: Richard C. Halverson, associate executive director of International Christian Leadership.

Comments: Charles E. Wilson, former president of the General Electric Co., and president of People-to-People, Inc.

Remarks: The Vice President, the Honorable RICHARD NIXON.

Handel's Hallelujah Chorus from the Messiah: University of Maryland Choir, conducted

by Fague Springman, director of music, University of Maryland.

Closing prayer: Abraham Vereide, founder and executive director of International Christian Leadership.

SIXTH ANNUAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Senator CARLSON. We are going to have the invocation this morning by the Secretary of the Army, Governor Brucker.

Secretary BRUCKER. Almighty God, at the start of this day we lift our hearts in prayer and renew again our allegiance to Thee, as well as our loyalty to our beloved country.

We come from all walks of life from around this world, and particularly from the Government, our Federal Government and the Congress, from the judiciary, and from all of the agencies and branches of the executive department of our Government.

We thank Thee for this opportunity, while we are here in Washington in Government service, to serve Thee and to impress upon our Government our ideas of the Christian ideals.

Grant us the knowledge to perpetuate the high principles and lofty ideals upon which this Nation was founded; grant us the wisdom to understand it. Grant us strength in purpose, and may we dedicate to the liberation of this great Christian leadership group the resolve that no matter what the future may hold in store for the United States, this Nation, under God, shall stand firm and incorruptible upon the rock of Christian principles, and that it shall continue to hold high the bright light of Christian idealism in order to light mankind's pathway to true peace.

Our heavenly Father, bless this food to our use and help us to provide daily service. Amen.

PROCEEDINGS

Senator CARLSON. I hate to do this. I realize that most of you are not only enjoying a good breakfast, but you are also enjoying a great fellowship.

However, it is necessary that we get this program under way because we have people who have to get back to the office and back to work, and we are delighted, of course, that there are so many present for this sixth annual breakfast of the International Christian Leadership.

We are very happy to see so many members of the President's Cabinet; members of the United States Supreme Court; members of the diplomatic corps; Members of Congress; business executives and citizens from all over, and I only regret time will not permit me to have all of you stand; I would like to introduce you.

This annual breakfast is in commemoration of the organization of the breakfast prayer group 24 years ago in Seattle, Wash. Now these groups have been organized in every section of the Nation, and there are many of them meeting in foreign countries and in this country. Now this is truly a dedicated group with a spiritual consideration of the practical problems which we believe can be solved by groups such as this, and we believe that the cornerstone of American life rests on a strong prayer group foundation.

The membership of this group, these prayer groups, is made up from all segments of social and economic life; Congress, Industry, Government, the House and Senate; labor and professions.

Now we meet in these prayer groups, believing that in these troubled and uncertain times we need and we must rely on divine guidance. We firmly believe that the greatness of America comes from the loyalty, patriotism, and righteousness of our people. We believe, too, that much more goes into the making of a great nation than such tangible things as natural resources, rich

mines, fertile fields, and immense industries. And we have all these. We believe it is imperative to preserve and save our sacred freedom, and that we must have a strong and courageous God-fearing people and total mobilization of all the forces of this Nation.

Now this breakfast is the first session of the International Christian Leadership group. I am going to give some announcements later of the meetings. We are going to meet here for 3 days, and discussions will be held on the topic, God's Order in Man's Affairs.

Now this morning we are going to have passages of Scripture read from both the Old and New Testaments.

First will be Justice William Brennan of the United States Supreme Court who will read from the Old Testament, and portions of the New Testament will be read by the Honorable Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of the Treasury.

(The Scripture read was Isaiah 12: 2-6 and Ephesians 1: 3-14.)

Senator CARLSON. Every Wednesday morning we have a prayer breakfast in the United States Senate. Every Thursday morning there is a prayer breakfast held by Members of the House of Representatives.

This morning we are going to be favored by greetings from these two groups. First we are going to have greetings from the House breakfast prayer group by the Honorable H. L. FOUNTAIN, Congressman from North Carolina. Following that we are going to have a word of greeting from the head of the Senate breakfast prayer group, the Honorable JOHN STENNIS, Senator from Mississippi.

Congressman FOUNTAIN. Senator CARLSON, and friends, I have the very high privilege this morning of bringing you greetings in this fashion, from what to me is one of the finest organizations and institutions in America, and that is the regular Thursday morning prayer group in the House of Representatives.

Surely Senator STENNIS, who is a brother Presbyterian, must feel, as I do, that something good is going to come out of these prayer groups.

I came to Washington in 1953, the year when the Presidential prayer breakfast was inaugurated, and it was an inspiration for me to discover that meeting in one of the small rooms of the Capitol were a group of dedicated and devoted men and women who were seeking an answer, not only to problems which face the Nation and the world, but problems which faced them.

So every Thursday morning a group of some 40 to 60, varying in number, Members of the House of Representatives, meeting without any rules and regulations, or without any particular credit, but meeting in spiritual friendship and understanding and love, discuss among ourselves our mutual problems and personal problems, and problems of the world.

I believe I can truthfully say that the group which I have the honor to represent here this morning, believes truly that the strength of America resides in the hearts, in the minds, and in the dispositions of her people, and that no material prosperity will ever advantage us if the levels of Christian citizenship and public wholesomeness are not raised by religious training.

Our group, I believe, believes that prayer is just as indispensable to the soul as oxygen is to the body. And because of our own personal problems and frailties, we realize that there is an outside reserve upon whom we must call from time to time.

We in the prayer group believe also that in this hour while the world is in a turmoil and redemption for both commerce and mankind is being worked out in so many mysterious ways, it is essential that we call upon Almighty God in prayer for more faith in Him, for better understanding of the mag-

nificent purpose of our lives, and for a greater courage to fulfill the many glorious paths He has committed to us.

We, the members of that group, are there, I am sure, because like millions of other Americans we are trying to find the answer to the confusion, the moral sickness, and the spiritual emptiness that possesses the world.

We are seeking for comfort, for peace, and for guidance, and so I am very happy to bring from this group of men and women, dedicated men and women of faith, greetings and felicitations this morning, and in doing so, may I express for them and myself the hope that each of you and yours will enjoy the blessings of God, and may He walk with each of you and yours, not only during the current year 1958, but may He walk and be with you always, during every year.

[Applause.]

Senator STENNIS. Senator Carlson, Mr. Vice President, friends, I am pleased to be able to bring you greetings from the 12 to 20 Senators who meet every Wednesday morning in the Senate restaurant for the breakfast group, meeting there for an exchange of spiritual thoughts, experiences, and inspiration.

For weeks now one of the Senate committees has been sitting, taking testimony with reference to our entire military program.

After we had heard from the military, the scientists, those charged with official responsibility in Government, as well as other outstanding men—testimony about satellites and missiles; military problems of all kinds.

Near the close of that testimony we called back to our conference room General LeMay, long time Chief of our Strategic Air Corps—the big bombers—asking him for his top No. 1 priority of need. We moved forward to the edge of our chairs with pencils poised to take notes, some thinking he would say bombers, others that he might say missiles or various other military weapons.

He didn't list as No. 1 any of those things, but rather said: "What we need most is men, trained men. We want men that are dedicated with a high sense of duty; we need men who feel that they have a mission in life."

And, as that great military leader left that room, I was tremendously impressed with the fact that, in this atomic age, in this age of missiles, he puts first not more weapons but more men trained in the very things that can come only from those who have a spiritual life, believing that those are qualities that come from those who have spiritual values and who have been trained from youth with the idea of duty and with a sense of mission.

So I pass that on to this great group this morning. You are among those of the world who are helping create that, the thought, the training, and the spirit of great spiritual values and spiritual training, creating thus the great spiritual reservoir of the Free World upon which civilization as we know it is having to stand today, and will perhaps face even greater tasks tomorrow.

I congratulate you in your great mission.

We of the Senate appreciate the great spiritual values of America and all the nations of the world. May you help us, and we pray God that we might in some way help you to keep your eye on those spiritual values from which strength and from which only true strength can come.

May God sustain us. [Applause.]

Senator CARLSON. Thank you, Mr. FOUNTAIN and Senator STENNIS.

I knew you were going to bring the Presbyterians in there somehow, though I didn't know how.

My regret is that Congressman Brooks HAYS, of Little Rock, Ark., is not here this morning. He is one of the outstanding Christian leaders and president of the Southern Baptist Convention.

He tells that before he became a Congressman he was prosecutor in Little Rock, Ark., and while there it became his sad duty to prosecute a young man for forgery. The young man was convicted and sent to prison. One of the hardest things he had to do was write his mother; he didn't know how to write to her, and finally he wrote this: "Dear Mother: I hope you won't worry about me. Things are pretty much the same here as they are at home. The Baptists are in the majority here, too." [Laughter.]

Before we proceed with the few short speeches we are to have this morning, I want to introduce the other folks who are sitting at the head of the table who will not participate.

First, the Speaker of the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada, the Honorable Roland Michener. [Applause.]

We are also favored this morning by having at the speakers' table a member of the Bundestag, Bonn, Germany, Mr. Gustav-Adolf-Gedat.

We have at the table also the president of the International Christian Leadership, a man who is devoted to Christian work and has been very active in it, and the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, Judge Boyd Leedom. [Applause.]

We have a man from out in the Middle West, a former Governor of South Dakota, Commissioner Sigurd Anderson, member of the Federal Trade Commission. [Applause.]

Then we come to a man whom I think you will most appreciate this morning; he is the host, you are his guests. He is picking up the check for this breakfast; Mr. W. C. Jones, of Los Angeles, Calif. [Applause.]

I have some wires here that I will not read. First, we have a wire from the honorary chairman of the International Council for Christian Leadership, Princess Wilhelmina of the Netherlands.

We have a wire from a very personal friend of mine and past president of the International Christian Leadership, who planned to be with us to speak this morning. Very briefly I talked with him over the phone, and he has had a bad case of the flu.

The Honorable Price Daniel, Governor of the State of Texas, expressed regret that he cannot be with us.

I have a wire this morning from a man whom I had hoped would be here in order that we might at least express our thanks, and honor him for his past interest in this breakfast.

He was your host for 5 years. Mr. Jones, this is a 5-year program.

Conrad Hilton has had a very personal interest in this prayer breakfast. He has been very helpful in every way, and he wanted to be here, and regrets he was unable to be with us this morning.

I am going to break a rule now that I said I wouldn't break today and point out someone in the audience. They are two of my very good friends who are outstanding, and they are here attending this session. I would like to have them stand—Roy Rogers and Dale Evans. Will you stand please? [Applause.]

I believe we can proceed now with our very brief program, and I am going to ask Mr. Richard Halverson, the associate executive director of International Christian Leadership, to lead us in our prayer of dedication.

Mr. HALVERSON. Let us unite together in prayer.

Our Heavenly Father, we are gathered here this morning at a time in world history when we see, as perhaps no other generation has seen, the futility of humanity's efforts without Jesus Christ, God's Son.

We know that the Word demonstrates this again and again, from Genesis to Revelation, the futility of human efforts, and we thank Thee, our Father, that Thou hast made redemption possible through Jesus Christ, the

Lamb of God, that takes away the sins of the world; we thank Thee that He laid down his life that we might be reconciled to do good and be redeemed forever.

Wilt Thou forgive us, our Father, for stupid human pride that lets us make the same mistakes again and again, generation by generation, civilization by civilization, that trusts in the institutions of men, and the programs of men, and the systems of men.

Oh, Father, don't let us make that mistake today. Thou hast blessed our Nation beyond the wildest dreams, and yet we go on in our pride, in our indifference to Thee, and, our Father, we pray that Thou wilt bring upon us a spirit of repentance and confession of our sins and acknowledgment of our desperate need of Jesus Christ in this day. Help us to see, our Father, the things Thou art trying to teach us in this world.

We cry peace, peace, when there is no peace and can be no peace, if we will not accept the Prince of Peace.

So we dedicate ourselves to Him this morning, the One who shall have a name that is above every name, and that at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow of the things up in heaven, the things on the earth, and the things under the earth, and every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

We dedicate ourselves to Him, our Saviour, our Lord, our God.

We pray that He shall march through these halls this day and through our nations, that men will see Him, and love Him, and trust Him, and obey Him.

We ask this in His name and for His sake. Amen.

Senator CARLSON. We are very fortunate to have one of the Nation's outstanding business executives as speaker. He has taken a very active interest in Christian lay work; past president of the General Electric Co., and president of the program known as People to People, Inc., since 1956 when President Eisenhower invited some very outstanding leaders of the United States to the White House conference on a people-to-people program.

This morning I give you the president of the people-to-people program, Mr. Charles E. Wilson.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Vice President, ladies and gentlemen, it is more than an inspiration to attend an early morning meeting to invoke the blessings of Almighty God on the work of our President, his colleagues in the administration, the Congress, the courts of justice, the dedicated men and women in uniform, and all others having to do with the welfare and security of our Nation.

It is almost symbolic of the spiritual heritage of the American people who came from the Old Country to the New World seeking the right to worship their Maker as He was made known to them. From this right of religious freedom flows all the other liberties enjoyed by our countrymen, and unceasingly sought by the people of the earth everywhere.

In the last half century, as we look back, it is clear that mankind has been caught up in a conflict of ideologies, the forces of sheer materialism against the desire and right of individuals to seek life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness under the law.

From our very beginning, at Plymouth, Jamestown, and so forth, and carried forward by the western pioneers, our history is replete with the theme. "This Nation Under God," which Governor Daniels was supposed to develop—which theme he was supposed to develop a little later, and I am mighty sorry he can't be with us.

William Bradford remembered, as Governor Clement said, that the Lord bade them to join themselves in the fellowship of the Gospel, to walk in all his ways made known.

Today the moral responsibility of the individual human being is greater, perhaps, than

ever before in history. He has leapt forward into space with technological advances, challenging his spiritual ability to cope with them; he has found that materialism now threatens his very existence. He needs and he seeks a spiritual reawakening. Through his own deeds he has come face to face with the divine admonition, Do unto others as you would have them do unto you. Two generations have recognized the inherent truth in the Scriptures which tell us, he who lives by the sword, will perish by it.

Governments cannot do for man that which he will not do for himself in his own heart and in his own home.

Mr. Vice President, men will always be grateful to you for inspiring and assisting the program of people-to-people communication; to do for themselves what governments have thus far been unable to do, try to bring about understanding and confidence between the everyday people of the world, which has now become one neighborhood with a known great common purpose, the Bible.

I, for one, have no fears in open and honest comparison of the Communist way of life with that of free people. I welcome the exchange agreement recently announced between the United States and Russia. Let the scientist, the student, the teacher of each nation visit one another. Let us engage cultural activities, and let there be exhibitions and exchanges. We have much to learn and to give, and nothing to fear. Let us know one another. This is the very essence of the people-to-people idea.

Within the last 2 months, I think it is, Khrushchev laid bare the usual dauntlessness of communism and Communist leaders.

It is a singular thing, it seems to me, that the Bible says nothing about belief in God. It simply says that not to do so is foolish. It says, the fool in his heart has said, there is no God. A man who thinks can find abundant evidence of God's existence wherever he turns his eyes. Every man paints his own picture of God. Speak God's name into the ears of a thousand men, and a different conception is aroused in the mind of each one, because what we are determines what we see.

In the dark days before the Civil War when everything seemed lost, Fred Douglas was speaking very pessimistically to a very great audience in Rochester, N. Y., when one woman got up and stretching out her bony arms toward Douglas she said, "Frederick, is God dead?"

There is the crux of the whole matter. God is not dead, and we may be sure that justice and right will prevail. Wrong's triumphant for a time, in too many parts of the world. Good causes may have had many setbacks. It may seem that all that is right has been outmoded, but if you still believe God lives and reigns, you cannot despair.

Many things that have gone on in the world in the past two decades have led people to feel that men believe more in force than in righteousness. But God has not abdicated. He is still in control of things, be sure of that. It may even be that the world will have to suffer yet more before men feel as they should and place their utter dependence in God.

There have been events in recent years that give us reason to believe the fear of God has so faded from the thoughts of men that not even the various rascals that walk the earth are afraid of God now. But I also firmly believe that humanity has been disclosing itself anew to us, and that these difficult times have reinterpreted God to us.

We have come to feel that all that is best in life is lost to us unless the God who is on the throne of the universe, is one who will deal out justice to men. Sickened by brutal atrocities and impudent dishonesties, we have come to feel that God cannot be

God unless he is angry at the blatantly wicked every day.

The Founders of America knew and proclaimed that the American ideal would succeed only insofar as the people of this Nation were themselves by inner dedication and discipline governed and directed by the Almighty God.

The time of our delivery from the chaos caused by the Communist system, with the consequent world turmoil, savage injustices and brutality, will be coincident with the acceptance by the people of the world of this same inner dedication and discipline, governed and directed by the God of their respective concepts of the Deity.

Mr. Vice President, in recent days, two, no, three, distinguished Americans, Adm. Lewis Strauss and Adlai Stevenson, and I think last night Gov. Sherman Adams, have suggested that the time has come when men of good will from the nations of the earth, meet under nongovernmental auspices to engage in frank and full discussions of how mankind may find a safe-conduct pass into the new and unexplored world now opening by the unlocking of the atom piercing of space. With these suggestions I heartily concur, and I think you may recall, sir, that as early as last June we offered the facilities of the People to People Foundation to carry forward Admiral Strauss' original suggestion, made months earlier.

Such a meeting of these people of the world would permit each person to speak as a human being, rather than as a member of a government team instructed to reach preconceived conclusions for transient propaganda purposes, of which I think the world is sick and tired. This would truly be a parliament of people seeking guidance of the Almighty to guide their respective governments into new and sure pathways of peace.

We know, Mr. Vice President, how close such a mission is to your heart. Further, I am happy to report that men of good will of every political persuasion and every religious belief with whom I have discussed the matter, concur that only through such a parliament of the people will the yearnings and wishes of mankind for peace become fully known and workable.

This we must do soon.

In conclusion, as one not unfamiliar with the harnessing of energy for the benefit of mankind, may I say how deeply impressed I am with those skills of Russia and America which have put man-made satellites into outer space. May the cosmic observations both help man and humble man. But let us never forget, however high or however fast they travel around the globe toward the moon and the stars, that there in the outer regions of the constellations, there is God, still ruling the domain beyond man, to judge and to love.

May he bless us here this morning, and always. [Applause.]

Senator CARLSON. Thank you, Mr. Wilson, for that forceful and thought-provoking message.

All of us regret that the President was indisposed this morning and unable to be with us, and I would like to take a little time presenting the next speaker, but I am not going to do it except in this way, the Vice President of the United States.

Vice President Nixon. Senator Carlson, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, at this point in the program I know that most of those that are here from Government offices must get back to the office, and those who are here attending the conference must get on with the business of the conference.

Senator CARLSON asked me to respond on behalf of all the guests this morning for the hospitality we have received, and I welcome that opportunity.

In fact, I have attended many of these breakfasts over the years, and they are al-

ways an inspiration, and I think this one ranks among the very best of them all.

I would like to say there is only one point I should call the attention of the committee to on arrangements for a meeting like this in which we have the sponsorship of Christian organizations, that there should be no discrimination.

In that respect I know that out in the West we are very proud of our products, our farm products, and yet consider this breakfast that we had. We had Florida grapefruit; we had Virginia ham; Georgia grits; North Carolina sausage, and Delaware eggs. In fact, about the only product you allowed California to furnish was to pay the check. [Laughter.]

So as a fellow Californian may I say we are deeply appreciative, and we only suggest that in the next 5 years we would at least like to be able to furnish the strawberries on top of the grapefruit.

Now may I say just a word with regard to the very elegant comments that have been made by Mr. Wilson.

As you of course know, he was discussing not the activities of the Government in which we have an exchange program, of which the latest agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States was an example, but he was speaking of a much broader type of exchange, and in the long run much more important and more lasting, the exchange of people that occurs as a result of voluntary activities on the part of nongovernment organizations in this country and in the other countries throughout the world. I cannot emphasize how important this work is. I cannot emphasize how much you, individually, can contribute to the cause of peace and understanding by supporting the People to People program which Mr. Wilson so elegantly represents.

And in that connection I would like to underscore what he said with regard to the great challenge which faces the Free World and the people who want to be free throughout the world on both sides of the Iron Curtain today.

We hear a lot of pessimistic talk these days about the problems we have in the United States and in the other parts of the world. People are concerned about economic conditions; they are concerned because of the terrible potentialities of atomic warfare, the new missiles that may destroy us with very little warning, if any.

All of these are problems which they think make this possibly the worst of all possible times in which to live. But I think that, too, we should all recognize that we couldn't have a better time, a more challenging time, in which to live on this continent and in this world, because the opportunities that we have today have been unequalled in the history of the world.

Consider, for instance, the food that we have today. We become concerned sometimes about surplus of food that we have, which is, I believe, one of Secretary Benson's major problems and ours as Americans. And yet all you have to do is to look back through history to know that for centuries men were wondering where they could find enough in the way of agricultural products to take care of minimum needs of the people of the world.

As a result, not only of new inventions in the field of agriculture but in other areas, for the first time in recorded history, in our time of being, the people of the world have within their power the resources to clothe and feed and house all the 2 billion people on this earth at some decent minimum standard. This is, then, acclamatory in one respect, and in this whole area of war and peace the very fact that we are today discussing the possibility of great nations ending the threat of war, the fact that war itself has become so terrible, its anticipation and its possibilities, indicate what the opportunity is for us in this Nation to help lead

the world to an era in which we can settle our differences at the conference table rather than on the battlefield.

Now I say that type of challenge is one we should enjoy meeting; it is one in which we appreciate the opportunity for leadership which may have been placed upon us, and I would only close by suggesting that we can and will meet this challenge, provided we have the inner strength which has made America the great country it is today, and which we need above everything else if we are to survive against others in the world, particularly leaders and not people, but others who are dedicated not to peace, not to freedom for all, but to world domination, because, make no mistake about it, whatever we may think of the ideology of those who lead the Communist world, they know what they want; they believe in it; they are dedicated; they are willing to make any sacrifice to gain their end, so what we need on our side is the same dedication; the same belief in our religious principles, and

the same willingness to sacrifice economically, anything, in order not to dominate the world but in order that all peoples will have the opportunity to national independence, to freedom, and the opportunity to live in peace with each other.

Now this is a great principle, a great challenge for all of us, and I know that the fact that this conference will be held here in Washington, will be a splendid influence in strengthening the resolve of those of us in Government who provide the leadership that America and the Free World needs today.

We thank you for coming, and we wish you well during the course of your stay here. [Applause.]

SENATOR CARLSON. Thank you, Mr. Vice President. We very much appreciate your attendance, and the splendid remarks you have made.

I suggest now that we all rise and we will have the Hallelujah Chorus sung by the University of Maryland Choir, under the direction of Fague Springman.

I think it was wonderful of them to come over today, and we will remain standing then for the closing prayer by Mr. Abraham Ver-eide.

(Alleluiah Chorus by the University of Maryland Choir.)

MR. VEREIDE: Eternal God, Hallelujah, we sing, we say, we pray, for God eternally reigneth, and we thank Thee this morning for meeting with us, charging and recharging our batteries and strengthening us for the task ahead. In Thy presence there are no wants; by Thy grace we walk forth with a consciousness of Thee, and pray Thy presence hour by hour, trusting Thee for wisdom, for power, for love, for the sound mind for every situation, and unto Thee we give all the praise, our Father, who now, oh God, we trust for thy special touch upon our President; help him, O God; bless him and keep him, and our Secretary of State, and all our officials, that they may serve Thee and serve this Nation.

(The Lord's Prayer.)

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1958

Dr. Frederick E. Reissig, executive secretary, Council of Churches, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the Good Shepherd, our refuge and strength, the bread of life, the spring of living water, grant to each of us this day the faith that assures us that Thou art all of these, and more, to us.

To all who travel this day by land or sea or air, grant a safe journey. Be Thou the physician to all who wait for healing.

Shed Thy light upon our paths, lest we fumble, and stumble, and fall, and fail both Thee and others.

Through Him who is the way and the truth and the life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Thursday, February 13, 1958, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. REUSS, of Wisconsin, as a member of the Joint Economic Committee.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

MR. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] may be excused from attendance on the Senate for the week of February 17 through 22, for the

purpose of participating in active duty with the Air Force.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. McNAMARA, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY

MR. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until noon Wednesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

MR. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have conferred with the distinguished minority leader; and I should like to announce that it is our hope that the Senate will conclude its business today by not later than 4 o'clock. We request the cooperation of all Members of the Senate. As all of us are aware, the weather is very inclement, and the roads are in dangerous condition for travel. I hope it will be possible for the session today to be concluded at an early hour, so the employees, who are so dedicated, and who so faithfully serve the Senate, may have an opportunity to return to their homes before nightfall.

MR. President, I announce that there will be no rollcalls today, if they can be avoided. We plan to have two general statements made by Senators.

On Wednesday we expect to have the Senate proceed with the consideration of Calendar 1178, House bill 5822, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 with respect to the reinvestment by air carriers of the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment.

We hope to have the consideration of that bill followed by the consideration of the postal pay bill and the classified pay bill and the postal rate bill. I understand that the committee will conclude its hearings tomorrow.

CALL OF THE CALENDER DISPENSED WITH

MR. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MR. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Everett F. Drumright, of Oklahoma, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to China.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.